D W Gerhard

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA

Rittenhouse Orrery

UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

STORAGE
205
R255
V22
1875

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1875.

ART. I.—THE SUPPRESSION OF THE ORDER OF JESUITS IN THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

BY NATHAN C. SCHAEFFER, LEIPZIG, GERMANY.

To an American, who has lived all his life in the atmosphere of religious freedom, the suppression of the Order of Jesuits by the German government appears, at first sight, very unreasonable and unjust. The measure seems to carry on its face the stamp of intolerance and oppression. But before one can pass judgment upon the real merits of the case, it is necessary to take into consideration the peculiar character impressed upon the Order when it was founded, the nature of its activity since that time, and especially the policy which it has pursued in the present century. And it will assist our investigation, if we cast a glance, in the first place, at the founder of the Order.

Upon the beautiful hill of Monserrat, a day's journey from Barcelona, can still be seen the ruins of a monastery, whose chapel was once the favorite resort of pilgrims. Hither came, in the year 1522, a Spanish cavalier, riding a mule, dressed in sackcloth, with a girdle of rope around his body, and a long pilgrim's staff laid across the saddle. Three days he spends in confessing his sins and in revealing his plans to an aged priest. Then, like a young man who expects to be dubbed a knight, he spends the night preceding the

205
R255

v.22, 1875

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

25th of March in watching and in preparing himself for spiritual knighthood. With his head and left foot bare, and on his right a bast-shoe, for he was lame, sometimes kneeling and sometimes leaning upon his staff, he weeps and prays, vowing that he will make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, for the purpose of converting the unbelieving. When morning comes he takes the sacrament, hangs the dagger and his sword on a pillar near the altar, and then starts out on foot with the intention of fulfilling his vow.

It is Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Order of Jesuits. The scene just described furnishes a partial index to his character. It shows his ardent zeal, his strong will, his powers of self-renunciation, and his deep earnestness with reference to the solemn interests of eternity. His wounded leg points to active service on the battle-field, where he learned the value of implicit obedience and thorough organization. In addition to these qualities he possessed faith as firm as a rock, a heart full of sympathy and love for his fellowmen, keen discernment of character, and great skill in adapting himself to the peculiarities of others. Without these qualities he could not have matured and carried out his plans. For it required an iron will and unflinching perseverance to complete the course of study which he began at thirty-three. In spite of his zeal it was difficult for him to learn. The verb *Amo* distracted his attention, because while conjugating it he could not help thinking of the heavenly sweetness of Christian love. Most of the time, too, he had to live on what he could beg. Nevertheless his enthusiasm and his skill in making himself all things to all men, won for him at the University a small band of faithful friends, over whom he gained almost absolute control. But his most remarkable traits were his fanaticism and his unbounded confidence in the Romish Church. One of his sentences affirms that if the church declares a thing black, which to us looks white, we should without hesitation call it black.

We would naturally expect the society founded by such a man to be a sort of mirror reflecting the man himself; and in this we are not disappointed. It is thoroughly organized. At its head stands a general, with officers under him, who preside over particular provinces. The members are divided into four different classes, ranking one above the other ; and each member is expected to render implicit obedience to the higher authorities. Already the name Societas is significant, for it was chosen as the best rendering of *Compania*, the Spanish word for a company of soldiers. The members of the Order delight to speak of themselves as a kind of spiritual militia, whose object is to fight for God under the banner of the Cross of Christ. And every candid reader of history must confess that in their warfare against the enemies of Romanism, they have shown the same fearlessness of danger and the same spirit of endurance which their founder manifested on the battlefield and under the hands of the surgeon.*

The recruits for this spiritual army are trained, in part at least, by means of the *exercitia spiritualia*, which are designed to produce the same experiences as those which Loyola passed through in the cave near Marensa. They usually last four weeks, although the term may be lengthened or shortened if circumstances require. The person who passes through these exercises, submits himself entirely to his spiritual guide. In the first week he reflects upon sin; in the second upon the life of Christ; in the third upon His sufferings and death; in the fourth upon His resurrection, ascension and glorification. The design of these reflections is to make the candidate pass through the successive stages of *purification, enlightenment* and *reconciliation with God.* All the powers of the soul are to be called into activity during the exercises; the imagination is expected to transform the events upon which he meditates, into living realities before the mind's eye. In visions he is to see the fall of the angels and of man, to perceive with his five senses the horrors of hell, to hear the Persons of the Trinity discuss the plan of salvation, to witness the Baptism in the Jordan, the Transfiguration on the Mount, the celebration of the Last Supper, the dying agonies upon the Cross, and the scenes which transpired on the morning of the Resurrection. Sensible objects like dead men's bones and newly-plucked flowers are employed to work upon his feelings; he begins his meditations in a room darkened by heavy curtains; he finishes them under the influence of sunlight and the other comforts of life. The castigation of the body does not amount to much; experience had taught Loyola how indispensable health is to those who wish to be useful in life. Those whose natures are so cold that these exercises make no impression upon them, are of course not fitted to become adepts of the Order. Hence those only who pass through these meditations successfully, are allowed to go on. The Society shows further discrimination in selecting those, whom nature has favored with special talent and a prepossessing external appearance.

---

*To heal his leg properly the surgeon broke it twice, and then sawed off a protuberance below the knee, because the proud cavalier thought he could not endure such a deformity. During these operations he never uttered an exclamation of pain, but only clenched his fist. It was in the days when medical men knew nothing of chloroform and the other anæsthetics.

The subsequent training which the candidate receives, is well calculated to make him an efficient member of the Order. He passes through a course of study and discipline, extending over fourteen years or more; and the instruction which he gives to others during a part of this time, makes him thorough in his knowledge and acquirements. The regulations mark out how he shall spend his time from early dawn till late at night; they specify how he must walk, hold his head, and conduct himself in his outward deportment. He is taught to confess his virtues as well as his faults. As God tried Abraham, so shall the novice be tried by temptations suited to his strength. At stated times he must perform menial services, take care of the sick or support himself by begging. If he has any property he is not allowed to will it to his relatives, but he must bestow it upon the poor, which of course is usually construed to mean the Society. Should he be expelled he does not receive back any of his former possessions—an arrangement which puts him entirely at the mercy of his superiors. His father and mother, his brothers and sisters, and his other relatives must be to him as those that were, but are no more. All letters which he writes or receives are examined. The members exercise the closest watchfulness over one another, and report whatever fault, misconduct or praiseworthy deed falls under their notice. Full reports are sent to the general at Rome; his archives and the provincial records show the talents and the weaknesses of every individual under him; hence he seldom fails in his appointments to bring the right man into the right place. But that which more than anything else gives the Society its executive efficiency is the vow of unconditional obedience. True, this vow is only taken by the members of the highest class, the *professi quatuor votorum*, but it is the class by means of which the Order has exerted its marvelous influence upon the destinies of nations. Moreover the Book of Constitutions teaches that every one shall regard his superior officer as the representative of divine Providence, that it is the duty of each member to allow himself to be moved hither and thither like a corpse, or like the staff which an old man carries in his hand.* An army officer is satisfied if his soldiers obey in their external bodily movements; Jesuitism requires obedience also on the part of the inner man. According to its tenets, the person who simply carries out what is commanded, is no better than a vile slave or a brute; obedience only becomes a virtue when it is rendered willingly; it becomes perfect when the inferior not only wills, but also thinks as his superior does. Such a sacrifice of the intellect of course nullifies the restriction, which enjoins non-conformity in cases where a positive sin is commanded. This whole system of training aims at converting the individual into an efficient instrument for carrying out the designs of the Papacy; under its influence he becomes a blind tool, a simple means to an end. In fact the entire Society is organized from the standpoint of utility.

It is very evident that a society thus organized and welded together into a compact whole, bound by religious vows and urged by a sense of its own interests to further the interests of the Papacy, acknowledging neither the ties of blood nor those of fatherland, *might* become dangerous to the state, although it is not a priori certain that such would be the case. The verdict of history alone can decide whether this threatening possibility ever became a reality. When the society laid its code of statutes before Paul III., he is said to have exclaimed: "This is the finger of God." It was at a time when the Pope's authority was waning, and his throne almost beginning to totter; the Reformation had commenced to spread in Italy; Protestant ideas were taking hold of the educated classes, and penetrating even into the ranks of the clergy. The Pope recognized the value of the new Society; he invested it with extraordinary privileges and prerogatives. Notwithstanding the vow of poverty, which is taken by the individual members, the Order as a whole received the right to accept donations, to carry on commerce and establish banks, to build houses and erect churches, to found Colleges and deliver lectures on all subjects. An interdict laid upon a country does not affect the members of the Society. Their persons are exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishops, their property from all tithes and taxes. A monarch violating these rights falls *ipso facto* under the ban of excommunication. Those who join the Order receive full pardon of all past sins at the time of entering and at death. On certain days a Jesuit can release a soul from purgatory by repeating the penitential psalms or five Pater-nosters and Ave-Marias; on other days he exercises extraordinary powers of absolution; in fact all indulgences and remissions which can be obtained at Rome can also be obtained in the churches of the Society, and that, too, in the same time. Specifications like these appear to a Protestant, if not laughable, at least of no value; but for a Catholic they are matters of the highest, yea of eternal importance, and hence for the Jesuits a source of unlimited power over the masses. It is impossible in this connection to state all the privileges which were granted by the Pope; the summary of them, when printed separately, forms of itself quite a compendium.

---

*Et sibi quisque persuadeat, quod qui sub Obedientia vivunt, se ferri ac regi a divina providentia per superiores suos, sinere debent, per inde ac si cadaver essent, quod quoquo versus ferri et quacumque ratione tractari se sinit; vel similiter atque senis vaculus, qui ubicumque et quacumque in re velit eo uti, qui eum manu tenet, ei inservit. Corpus Instit. Soc. Jesu. Pars vi. c. i. 375. I quote from the Antwerp edition, published in 1702.

Armed with these prerogatives, the Order went forth to do its work. The mission which it had proposed to itself was not an easy one. England, Scotland and the Scandinavian regions were lost to the faith which it professed. Protestantism had made its way into all parts of France; an ambassador from Venice declared that in the year 1561 three-fourths of the French provinces were filled with the doctrines of Calvin. In Germany and Austria nine-tenths of the population had fallen away from Catholicism; Catholic professors could no longer be found to fill the vacant chairs in the Universities; at Vienna no student had taken orders for a period of twenty years. Besides, the clergy had sunk so low in morals knowledge of the Scriptures and reverence for divine things, that scarcely any religion remained either among them, or among their people.* To revive the drooping faith and zeal of the masses, and to regain what had been lost, was the difficult work which fell, to the lot of the Society. Others might have shrunk back in despair; but not so the Jesuits, whose confidence in the cause which they had espoused was unlimited, and who considered no sacrifice too great if it conduced to restore the Roman church to its former power and glory. With untiring assiduity they devoted themselves to the preaching of the Word, to the instruction of the young and to the duties of the confessional. Their eloquence attracted and swayed the masses; their schools, being the best in the world, were attended by the children of Catholics and Protestants, whereby the rising generation was imbued with their religious ideas; their skill as father confessors gave them indescribable power over the consciences of monarchs and their subjects.

Before one generation had passed away, the Order had the satisfaction of seeing its pupils on regal thrones, wearing the Cardinal's purple, and filling the most prominent chairs in the Universities. Not only did they labor to convert those who in their eyes were heretics; but they also raised the emblems of man's salvation in hitherto unknown regions of the globe. "The history of their labors," says Bancroft, "is connected with the origin of every celebrated town in the annals of French America; not a cape was turned, not a river entered, but a Jesuit led the way."[†] In no long time their influence was felt from the banks of the Nile to those of the Ohio, and from the Arctic regions to the plains of Paraguay. Not without reason did one of the Generals of the Order boast to a French Duke in Paris: "You see, from this room I govern not only Paris but also China; and not only China but also the whole world; and that too without any one knowing how it is done."

But with this increase of power came also an increasing love of power, which at length grew into a passion for the same, and thus gave rise to numberless intrigues both to acquire more and to pre-

---

[*] "Dahin war es durch die heillose Wirthschaft des Papstthums gekommen, dass selbst Bellarmin das Geständniss ablegen muss; Einige Jahre, bevor die lutherische und calvinische Häresie enstanden, war keine Strenge bei den geistlichen Gerichten, keine Zucht der Sitten, keine Kenntniss der heligen Schriften, keine Achtung vor göttlichen Dingen, kurz beinahe gar keine Religion mehr vorhanden gewesen." Huber, Jesuiten Orden. Page 109.

[†] Their activity has not ceased even at this day. My cabin-mate on the steamer which took me across the Atlantic, had been a missionary on the Pacific Coast over fifteen years: his glowing accounts of the work done in British Columbia, almost led me to hope for the non-fulfillment of the sad prophecy, that a few centuries hence the red man will live only in history

serve that which had been acquired. I am here tempted to follow the example of Aeneas, who (according to Virgil) gave Dido an idea of the wiles of the Greeks by telling the story of Sinon and the wooden horse, prefacing it with the words, "*Ab uno disce omnes.*" At any rate, a few examples will suffice to give the reader a glimpse of what has been brought to the light of day in this direction. Motley, in his history of the Rise of the Dutch Republic, states towards the close of the third volume that the murderer of William of Orange had previously made known his designs to the rector of the college at Trier, and this eminent Jesuit not only pronounced his blessing upon the assassin, but also gave him the assurance that if he died in the attempt, he would be received into the company of the martyrs in heaven. It has been shown beyond doubt that the Jesuits knew of the celebrated Gunpowder plot in England, and yet did nothing to prevent its being carried into execution. In Poland they induced Sigismund III. to recognize and support the two Demetrii in their pretensions to the throne of the Czars, because they hoped by means of these pretenders to bring the whole Russian Empire under the sway of Rome. Louis XIV., it is well known, stood in criminal relations with a woman named Montespan. Bossuet had persuaded him to sever himself from her, but the intrigues spun by the king's father-confessor P. La Chaise, and others, renewed the friendship, and the consequences were two bastards. Subsequently (as is stated in a letter written by Elizabeth Charlotte, wife of Philip I. of Orleans) the same Jesuit persuaded the king, who had never read a word in the Bible, that all his sins on the above score would be remitted if he revoked the Edict of Nantes. It is hardly necessary to add that by doing so he drained France of its most enterprising citizens, and perhaps sowed some of the seeds, which a few generations later developed into the bloody fruits of the French Revolution. In Germany the Jesuits induced Matthias to name as his successor Archduke Ferdinand, who had made a vow that he would never injure the Church by making concessions to the heretics. Afterwards they were constantly urging him to introduce the Catholic faith by the force of arms. "The Thirty Years War," says Gfrörer, "was one-half the work of the Jesuits; the princes who, in this fearful contest, fought in behalf of the Catholic cause, played the part which the Jesuits had marked out for them." When we remember that at the close of this war the population had sunk to one-third, in some sections to one-fifth of the original number, that many a farmer was obliged to pull his own plow and scarcely knew where to get the seed for sowing, we need not wonder that in some places the name Jesuit was never uttered without a curse.

On a par with these intrigues is the system of ethics which the Order developed. To retain its hold on the men of the world, the expedient was adopted of lowering the standard of morals as much as possible. The priests were instructed to make matters easy for those confessing their sins, especially if they happened to be princes or merchants. A few of their precepts may not be out of place in this connection. If an honest man is unable to earn the necessaries of life, and yet feels ashamed to beg, it is allowable for him to take by stealth that which does not belong to him. The *reservatio mentalis* enables a man to make promises and to take an oath without binding himself. Escobar affirms that a promise is not binding if a person who makes it does not thereby intend to bind himself, but simply thinks of fulfilling it at the time when he makes the promise.* Castro Paolo asserts that it is allowable to make use of an ambiguous oath whenever there is a proper reason for concealing the truth. Another writer teaches how to multiply the chances of winning at a game of cards; the player makes a vow that he will donate a part of the gain to the poor, whereby he enlists the sympathy of God on his side. Their teachings in reference to the seventh commandment, I refrain from incorporating into this article, because a translation of them would disgrace the English language and defile the pages of this Review. The Jesuits themselves express surprise at finding how easy the yoke of Christ becomes to those imbued with their tenets.

In the contest which grew up between the Jansenists and the Jesuits, these dangerous maxims were attacked with energy and skill. The tactics which the Society adopted in defending itself, cannot fail to excite surprise. First, one of their number published an anonymous apology, defending the casuistry of their books on ethics. When this apology was condemned by the bishops and clergy, they declared that the apology had not gone forth from their midst. They also declared that the Order was not responsible for what individual members here and there might have taught. Hereupon the opponents pointed to the statute in the Book of Constitutions, which prohibits the members from publishing any book unless it is sanctioned by the Society. In their extremity they now declared that the maxims had been mis-quoted. The odds were fearfully against them. Nevertheless their cunning intrigues* carried the day; the adherents of Jansen's doctrines were obliged either to recant or suffer persecution.

---

*His name gave rise to the French word Escobarderie, which signifies what th Germans call "feine Lüge."

The Society's day of doom came at last. In the contest above referred to, they had triumphed physically, but intellectually they had suffered a defeat. "After they had been overcome in the sphere of mind," says Ranke, "they could not long remain in the possession of power." About the middle of the 17th century, Ministers in favor of reform came into power in all the States of Europe; and since the Order refused to be reformed, it was obliged to take the consequences. First it was suppressed in Portugal, where its members were accused, perhaps unjustly, of having conspired against the crown. Then it shared the same fate in France; soon afterwards also in Spain, where its members were treated with undue severity. Pope Clement XIV. finally made preparations to abolish the Order; he gained the consent of the Catholic monarchs;* and in the Bull which proclaimed the abolition, he states among other reasons, that so long as the Society exists it will be impossible to establish a true and lasting peace in the church.

Banished from all Catholic countries, where did the members find refuge? Strange to say, in Prussia and Russia. Frederick the Great declared that he needed them as teachers in Silesia, and Catherine II. thought she needed them to win for her the sympathies of her newly acquired Polish subjects.

---

*In reference to the cunning of the Order, Hase in his Polemik (page 287, 3d Ed.) says: "Ihre Weltklugheit hat den Völkern imponirt, wie sich's im Sprüchworte darstellt: mit einem Jesuiten finge man den Teufel auf offenem Felde. Aber auch: was der Teufel nicht machen kann, gibt er einem Jesuiten in Verding." The maxim, that the end justifies the means, is not found in any of their books, although a construction almost as bad can be put on sentences like the following: Quum finis est licitus etiam media sunt licita. Media honestantur a fine. The former belongs to Busenbaum, the latter to Fillincius. Pascal's Provincial letters and Huber's Jesuiten Orden (chap. vi.) contain large collections of the dangerous maxims propounded by Jesuitic authors.

No sooner had the nations of Europe thrown off the yoke of Napoleon, than a reaction set in, which brought along with it the restoration of the Order of Jesuits, with nearly all its former privileges. They soon became the ruling power in the church. Not inaptly do the Italians speak of a white and a black pope ; for the General of the Society is verily the power behind the throne. He is in appearance the servant, but in reality the master. He and his colleagues are the soul of the Ultramontane movements of the 19th century. During the forty-seven years which elapsed between the abolition and the restoration of the Society, the world moved ; whereas it (the Society) stood still, inasmuch as it continued to advocate and still advocates the prerogatives of the Papacy and the principles of intolerance which belong to a by-gone age. In the 16th century the Dukes of Bavaria persecuted the Lutherans in that province, in return for which the Pope granted them full power over the clergy. In this century, when the occupant of the same throne wished certain privileges from the Pope, the reply was, that he must first destroy the Lutheran heresy in his newly acquired dominions, anuul the religious freedom which had been lately introduced, free the clergy from all taxes and State jurisdiction, and place the press and the schools under the supervision of the bishops. In the year 1863 a concordat was formed with the Republic of Ecuador, which specifies that only the Catholic form of worship shall be tolerated in the republic, that every book forbidden by a bishop shall be confiscated by the government, that the State authorities shall assist the bishops in suppressing any attempts which may be made to lead astray the faithful, that a priest, even if he commits a crime which would be punishable according to the laws of the State, can only be tried by clerical judges, that the churches and cloisters shall have the right of asylum, so that no one can be arrested within their precincts un-

---

* The circumstance which induced Maria Theresa to give her consent, disproves an assertion, which I have heard from Catholic lips, viz., that never in the history of the world did a priest disclose the secrets of the confessional. The representations of the Bourbon courts had been of no effect; she was confirmed in her resolution not to yield her consent, by the opposition which her son Joseph manifested against the Order, for she delighted in acting contrary to his wishes. But one morning a slip of paper was handed to her, containing what she had confessed to the Jesuit Campmüller, concerning certain scruples of conscience which she had felt in reference to the partition of Poland. The fault of one man decided the fate of his colleagues in the Austrian empire.

less by special permission of the ecclesiastical authorities. The papal syllabus,[*] which was issued toward the close of the following year, (Dec. 3, 1864,) acknowledges that the Pope is unable to reconcile himself to the progress and civilization of modern times. It condemns freedom in matters of religion, conscience and thought, and claims for the church coercive power over its members, and the control of science, philosophy and public instruction. How beneficial to the cause of education such an arrangement would be, is apparent from the state of things in Italy. In the States of the Church only ten per cent. of the population are able to read. In the territory which formerly constituted the kingdom of Naples, and which was a favorite home of the Jesuits, only two out of a hundred can boast of this accomplishment. The public instruction came in 1818 entirely into the hands of the clergy, and at the end of 40 years 1,100 of the 3,000 parishes were without schools, and of the remainder 900 had schools with teachers that could neither read nor write![†] In Germany, where public instruction is in the hands of the state, it was found that all the recruits to the army could read and write, but that those with the poorest education came from the Catholic districts of Bavaria.

At first sight it might appear as if Ultramontanism wore a different aspect in Belgium, because here it sometimes made common cause with the liberal party; but the moment we inquire a little more closely into the matter, we find ourselves disappointed. "We have freedom of the press," says the *Echo du Luxembourg*, "but he who has the audacity to read any paper except the one which suits the fancy of the priest, receives an unmerciful refusal of the absolution. We have freedom of instruction; but the children who do not attend the schools of the clergy are not admitted to the first communion. We have the liberty of joining any society; but whoever is a member of an association forbidden by the clergy, *e. g.* a Lodge of Freemasons, is formally and decidedly put under the ban. We have religious freedom; but woe unto him who should dare to preach the Bible or anything not acceptable to the clergy. We have freedom in respect of preaching; but it only serves the purpose of insulting and brow-beating the State authorities. We have the freedom of the ballot-box; but whoever does not put therein the ticket furnished by the priest, is punished with the refusal of the Lord's Supper during life, and with the non-permission of burial in consecrated ground after death." What more could the Jesuits desire in a land where the masses are zealous Catholics? Free government under such circumstances, puts legislation entirely into their hands.

---

[*] The Syllabus is composed of 80 propositions, which the Pope condemns. We will quote three as specimens:

XV. Liberum cuique homini est eam amplecti ac profiteri religionem, quam rationis lumine quis ductus veram putaverit.

LXXVIII. Hinc laudabiliter in quibusdam Catholici nominis regionibus lege cantum est, ut hominibus illuc immigrantibus liceat publicum proprii cujus cultus exercitium habere.

LXXX. Romanus Pontifex potest ac debet cum progressu, cum liberalismo et cum recenti civilitate sese reconciliare et componere.

[†] Sybel's (Prof. in Bonn) Klerikale Politik im neunzehnten Jahrhundert, page 59. The author also complains that his experience during twelve years has been that one-fourth of the students coming from the Cath.Gymnasiums of the

It is plain from what has been adduced that the chief object or aim of Jesuitism is to gain and to retain power. Its organization makes it a state within the state. The history of its warfare against Protestantism, against the Jansenists, against the liberal tendencies of the 19th century, shows not only that it is unscrupulous in the means which it employs to secure its ends, but also that its aim is not so much the spread of true religion as the establish ment of a grand hierarchy, having at its head an absolute Pope, and under him a network of bishops and priests to assist in exercising sway over the nations of every clime and country. In theory this hierarchial fabric received its finishing touch with the proclamation of the Pope's infallibility, which is only a consequence of the maxim that every inferior is to regard his superior as the representative of Divine Providence.

In the very nature of the case such a centralizing tendency must at times come into collision with the national interests of different peoples. Cases have occurred in nearly every country upon the face of Europe. Already in the second decade of this century Russia had occasion to rue the policy pursued by Catharine II. In

---

Rhine province could not write grammatical German, and that perhaps three-fourths could not read an easy Greek or Latin author without difficulty. True, one of the editors of the "Katholik" called him and Schlosser manufacturers of history, Hegel and Cuno Fischer wretched sophists, etc., but to abuse men is not synonymous with refuting them.

Prussia matters came to a break in the year 1839. The king had ordained that children born of mixed marriages should follow the wishes of their parents in choosing a religion, and that where no such wish was expressed the religion of the father should decide the question, whereas the canon law required that all such children should be trained in the Catholic faith. The matter was settled through ambiguous diplomacy, and as long as Archbishop Spiegel lived there was no difficulty. But his successor bade defiance to the king's laws, forbade all mixed marriages, unless the promise was given beforehand that the children should be Catholic, and as a consequence he was thrown into prison. His colleague, the Archbishop of Posen, shared the same fate. Had Frederick William III. lived, Rome would, without doubt, have been obliged to yield. But no sooner had his son Frederick William IV. ascended the throne, than he sent an ambassador to Rome to make peace with the curia. He not only yielded what his father had demanded, but he also abolished the placetum regium, which required all correspondence between the bishops and the Pope to pass through the hands of the state; of his own accord he gave up the right, which the crown formerly had, of deciding the choice of the bishops, assisted in suppressing the so-called German-Catholic movement of 1844, placed the common schools under ecclesiastical authority, divided the gymnasiums between the two confessions, and established in the "cultus-ministerium" a special department for the Catholic Church. No wonder that Archbishop Ketteler declared no monarch had ever rendered the church such services; for here at a single stroke, and without any effort, they gained what they had long been vainly striving to acquire in Austria and Bavaria. The children born of mixed marriages, as a rule, became Catholic; the Protestant Church was losing all the time; calculations were already made to determine how soon at this rate heresy would die out.*

The years rolled on; the seventh decade came to a close; the political aspect of Europe assumed a new phase. The throne, from which the Pope was to proclaim his own infallibility, had been so placed that a ray of sunlight, coming through the Dome of St. Peter's, would fall upon Pius IX. while engaged in this solemn ceremony. But at the appointed hour a heavy thunder-storm had gathered in the heavens; it became so dark that a candle was needed to enable the Pope to read the documents before him. At the same time the clouds of another war were gathering over Europe. It broke out; the French troops were needed at home; Napoleon III. became a prisoner; Victor Emanuel saw that the time had come to complete the Union of Italy; Pius IX. lost his terrestrial dominions. Emperor William was still tarrying in Versailles, when a petition signed by 56 deputies of the Prussian Diet reached him, asking him to restore the Pope's temporal power. It contained the words: "For the Papacy there is no independence except that of sovereignty; only in this is its dignity (Würde) secure. A dethroned Pope is always a captive or an exiled Pope. May the new day of peace bring with it the needed re-establishment of the worldly authority of the papal see, toward which end your Majesty's father, Frederick William III., of blessed memory, cooperated in such an eminent manner at the Congress of Vienna." But this time it was not for the interest of Prussia to re-establish the temporal power of the Pope; she needed a United Italy in the South to counterbalance the power of France and Austria. Nevertheless in the imperial diet, when the reply to the address of the crown was prepared, the party of the centre (Ultramontane) demanded the insertion of a clause making the same request as the petition which the Emperor had received at Versailles. After an exciting discus-

---

* Still the Ultromontane party was not satisfied. In 1851 Prof. Busz, of Freiburg, who is said to have stood in intimate relations with the court at Vienna, declared the peaceful adjustment of the late difficulties between Austria and Prussia a heavy blow to the Catholic Church. He had cherished the hope that in case of a war an empire of seventy millions, then much talked of, might have been established under the Hegemony of Austria, and that thus the Catholic cause might have been greatly advanced. Some writers accuse the authorities at Rome of having plotted with Austria for the humiliation of Prussia. Some theories can be adduced to render such a thing plausible. Austria formed the Concordat of 1855 partly for the purpose of gaining the sympathy of the Catholics in Germany just as Prussia had gained the sympathy of the business population by establish ing the free trade union. When the war of '66 broke out it was stated in Vienna that reliable reports had come from North Germany stating that not a Catholic would fire a gun against the army of the Austrian Emperor. When the news of the total defeat of the Austrians at Königrätz reached Rome, Antonelli, the Pope's Secretary of State, is said to have exclaimed, "The world is going to smash." Still this looks too much like newspaper gossip to count much in the way of evidence. That the authorities at Rome sympathized with Austria is evident from the nature of the case; but that there was any scheming between the two powers for the destruction of Prussia, could only be proved by an examination of the archives at Vienna. Besides, Bismarck forced Austria to declare war. It was just what he wanted.

sion, the proposition was defeated by a vote of almost six to one. Of course bitter newspaper articles followed, both pro and con.

Meanwhile the Ultramontanes left no stone unturned to carry through the recognition of the infallibility dogma. They urged the matter through the press, in the schools, from the pulpit, in the confessional. The bishops forbade students to hear the lectures of such professors as would not bow the neck under the new yoke. For the same reason business men were threatened with the loss of custom, teachers were deprived of their positions and their daily bread, and women were dismissed from the confessional without receiving the absolution. On the last point a pamphlet from the pen of Prof. Reinckens (now Bishop) says: "Old men who have served the Lord for 80 years and have always been model men in the congregation, and girls of 17–18 years of age, full of innocence, who have just come out of school, are asked by young priests in the confessional concerning the infallibility, maltreated and then dismissed without the absolution. We know numberless examples of this kind. Women whose husbands have raised their voices against the innovations, are tormented by the priest both in and out of the confessional, until they carry strife into the family. The writer of this pamphlet has seen hot tears shed on account of such destruction of domestic happiness. * * The confessional is at present the inquisition, erected in all parts of the world. We only give indications; the evil surpasses the conception of every honest man. And all this misery, for what purpose is it needed? To kill the religious life—that the "cadaver obedience" of the Society of Jesus may henceforth be the principle of religion for the entire church. As the General of the Jesuits commands those selected for any mission, so will the Pope from now on command the faithful upon the earth, not only what they shall will but also what they shall think."

The government was in a dilemma. Here were two parties, the one persecuted, the other persecuting by means of the power vested in the Catholic department of the "cultus-ministerium." To abolish this department was sure to increase the misunderstandings with the curia at Rome; to allow things to on in the old way was equal to lending the arm of its power to coerce the consciences of a portion of its subjects. The former alternative was chosen. The government took its standpoint upon the modern platform of universal tolerance. It adopted the principle of securing freedom in matters of faith to all its subjects.* All the affairs of the cultus-ministerium were placed under one head; the schools were put under the immediate control of the state. When the German ambassador came to Rome, he was not received. Mothers took their sons from the gymnasiums, that the absolution might not be refused. In a short time the agitation had spread into every Catholic hamlet in in the empire. In France voices were heard in praise of the Jesuits; Renan declared, "We must cease to oppose them; when the day of our revenge comes, they wlll be useful allies." During the debate on the new school law, which took place in the Prussian House of Lords (Herrenhaus), Prince Bismarck read passages out of a late letter from the ambassador at Paris, to the effect that the hopes of revenge cherished in France grounded themselves on the religious dissensions in Germany. The letter which the Emperor William wrote last year in reply to the Pope's letter to him, expressly states that plots were being laid to undermine the authority of his government. Not only the government, but also many of the citizens felt that something must be done to ensure the safety of the newly created empire. Petitions came up from Cologne asking for the suppression of the Society of Jesus. The Society replied by getting its friends to send in petitions asking for the suppression of Freemasonry. On July 4, 1872, a law was passed excluding the Order of Jesus and societies similar to it from the territory of the German Empire, forbidding the further introduction of such establishments, and requiring all existing establishments to be dissolved within a period not exceeding six months. Foreigners belonging to the Order were required to leave the country; natives were permitted to remain, on condition that they cease their specific activity. Most of them migrated to Austria,

---

*One week after taking charge of the affairs of the cultus-ministerium, Dr. Falk (nephew of the former professor at Lancaster by that name) said in a speech: "Ich werde mich leiten lassen von dem satze, dass die Kirche und die Kirchengemeinschaften ihre Freiheit und ihre volle freie Bewegung behalten, ich werde ihnen da nie hemmend in den Weg treten. Aber meine Herren, wo Rechte des Staates in Frage sind, und Rechte die der Staat schützen muss gegen Jeden und auch gegen die Kirchengemeinschaften, da werden sie mich allerdings als Juristen sehen, ich werde alle unberechtigten Asprüche vollständig zurückweisen."

Belgium and France. Some asked for appointments as missionaries in America; a few remained in the capacity of teachers in private families.

Soon a net-work of religious societies under different names had spun itself all over Germany. The government examined their constitutions, and ordered the police to watch their mode of activity. To counteract the policy of the bishops, who, in some cases, withdrew their students from the universities into private seminaries, a law was made requiring all candidates for the Gospel ministry to pass an examination in philosophy, history and German literature before being inducted into office. To place the different confessions on an equal footing in reference to marriage, a new law was passed in imitation of the French code, requiring the ceremony to be performed and the records to be kept by a civil magistrate. If the parties afterwards wish the minister's blessing upon themselves, they can have the ceremony re-performed; but this is not required to make the marriage valid in the eyes of the law. The bishops, however, took no notice of these laws; they appointed one priest after another, who had not passed the required examination. To avoid paying the fines which the government imposed, they assigned their property to other parties. Hence the only alternative left was to punish them by imprisonment.

What the final issue of matters will be, no one can tell. That the breaking out of the conflict was a historical necessity is very evident. For the moment we plant ourselves upon the standpoint of the Jesuits, we can scarcely conceive how they could have acted differently. But the moment we look at the matter from the standpoint of tolerance and religious freedom, we cannot help justifying the policy of the German Government. Besides, to have allowed the Jesuits to carry out their schemes, would have been equal to committing gradual suicide. Whether all the measures adopted by the government have been wise, is a different question. The imprisonment of the bishops has won for them the sympathy of their people, just as the various attempts to assassinate Prince Bismarck have increased his popularity and his influence.

The suppression of Jesuitism in the German Empire forms the opening of another chapter in the history of that conflict between Church and State which began in the days of Gregory VII., and which has continued with intermissions down to the present time. In the eighth decade of the eleventh century the Pope had the power to dethrone the Emperor and free his subjects from the oath of allegiance ; in the same decade of the nineteenth century the Order which advocates the Pope's temporal power is banished from the Empire. Then Henry IV. was obliged to spend three days at Canossa, dressed in penitential robes, and shivering with cold, before he could obtain the removal of the ban and the renewed favor of those at home. In our day the Chancellor of the Empire gains the applause of the nation by the assertion : "To Canossa we will surely not go." Verily time produces changes. There have been times when the union of Church and State was a blessing to each ; to-day it is a clog to both. The money of the State is spent in the equipment of the army and in the erection of barracks. The Church sees her parishes in the flourishing cities growing to a membership of from ten to sixty thousand, and yet her means enable her to support for such parishes at the highest not more than five ministers. Protestants, Catholics, and Infidels are dissatisfied with the existing state of things ; but how the present age will adjust the difficulties, time alone can tell. If what has been said above will to some extent enable the American reader to form an intelligent opinion on some of the issues involved in this conflict, the object or end which the writer had in view will have been accomplished.

Leipzig, Nov. 11, 1874.

ART. II.—THE COSMICAL SCOPE OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. WM. RUPP, A. M., BERLIN, PA.

THERE is a theory which regards Christianity as being only an accidental and transient phenomenon in the organism of the universe. The universe, consisting of the entire material and spiritual creation, is supposed to be essentially complete and whole without it. It owes its existence, therefore, only to an accidental disorder in a very small part of God's vast creation, namely, the human world, and is consequently without meaning for the material world which is beneath man, and for the spiritual world which is above him. It is remedial only in its design or scope, and hence conditioned exclusively by the presence of the evil which it is designed to cure. Without that evil, which cannot be regarded as having its origin in the divine will and as being demanded by the divine plan of the world, there would have been no occasion or room for Christianity in the constitution of the world; and when once that evil shall have been removed, then all things in heaven and earth will be just exactly as they would have been, if man had never sinned and the Son of God had never come in the flesh. The cosmos at large, except perhaps in as far as it may have come under the influence of the corruption reigning in humanity, has no material interest in the economy of Christianity. Neither the world of matter, nor the world of spirit beyond man, is essentially related to, or affected by, this economy. At its first introduction into the world it was attended, indeed, by extraordinary or miraculous phenomena in nature, as well as by divers apparitions from the angelic world; but these were designed only as divine credentials, to prove its heavenly origin, and attest its divinity to the faith and confidence of men. Beyond that they have no meaning or importance.

This is, no doubt, the view of many in regard to the nature, relation and scope of Christianity. It is the view even which underlies many professed apologies for the Christian revelation. And we believe that this is one great reason why these apologies generally carry in themselves so little force for modern thinking. They are not convincing, just because the fundamental view upon which they are constructed is radically defective. While they seek to magnify the importance of the Christian revelation, they in fact diminish it; and while they are engaged in commending it to the understanding of the world as reasonable and worthy of credit, they in fact make it repulsive. For in this view, as all can easily see, Christianity becomes something unreal, unsubstantial, fantastical, and therefore something that it is hard to believe in. It is thus not only supernatural, in the sense of having its origin above the plane of the previous order of the world, and embodying forces and powers which are not of this world, but also anti-natural, in the sense of being contrary to the constitution and plan of the world as such. Its miracles are simply violations of the laws of nature, and its inspired prophecies violations of the laws of mind and history. It comes into the world as a disturbing element, refusing to fit into the order of the world, because it was not anticipated in the eternal plan of the world; and it must, therefore, be forever irreconcilable with that plan. The understanding can never bring it into harmony with any theory which assumes that the universe could in any circumstances be complete and whole without it

As against this view of Christianity in its relation to what is supposed to be the established order of the world, the celebrated argument of Hume against miracles must be admitted to be mainly in the right. Hume started with the assumption that, according to the universal experience of humanity, the world of nature is a finished system, with constant and forever fixed laws, and therefore admitting of no variation, modification or change. Hence he inferred, that no amount of evidence can ever prove a miracle; which would be a perfectly valid inference certainly, if the assumption underlying it were correct. It seems to be easy enough to detect the fallacy in this reasoning. The limited experience of the individual is evidently made to be the criterion for the universal experience of humanity. But from the fact that the experience of a single individual, or the experience of all individuals of a single age, involves no evidence of the occurrence of a miracle, it follows by no means that the universal experience of humanity may not involve such evidence, and that the system of nature must be in itself forever fixed and unchangeable. That is a mere *a priori* assumption which Hume, from his sensational standpoint at least, could never have proved; an assumption, indeed, which modern scientific investigations, especially in the domain of Geology, have *disproved.* The same assumption substantially, however, underlies the view of Christianity and the world of which we are now speaking. To hold to the assumption that the plan of the world is complete and whole without Christianity, and yet to believe in Christianity as a divine reality, fraught with the most momentous consequences for mankind, but without significance or importance to the world as a whole, is a logical performance of which, to say the least, all minds are not capable.

But this is not the view which Christianity presents of itself and its relation to the world in its own authentic records. A profounder study of the New Testament will, we are firmly persuaded, lead to the recognition that Christianity is more than a transient phenomenon in the world, brought in to cure the evil of sin, and destined, when that object is accomplished, to vanish again and leave all things substantially as they were before sin had made its appearance. If we would do justice to the idea of Christianity as this is presented in the New Testament, we are bound to acknowledge in it, not only the power of redemption for humanity, but also the ultimate sense and meaning of the entire universe—the cosmos, the whole world of nature as well as the whole world of spirit. It is not simply an episode in the grand poem of creation, but the leading theme; not a side-issue in the solemn history of the universe, but the final, all-controlling aim; not an afterthought, but the central idea of God's eternal counsels. Not only are all contradictions in heaven and earth reconciled in it, but the universe is also completed and glorified in it. It has a world-perfecting, world-glorifying, as well as a world-saving design or aim. The whole world of nature and the whole world of spirit receive their crowning glory and the perfection of their being only from the relation in which they stand to the economy of Christianity. As the flower unfolds the meaning of the life and growth of the plant, so does Christianity unfold the inmost sense and meaning of the whole creation; and as the life of the plant from the beginning of its growth points to the flower and seed as the end of its development, so does the process of creation from the beginning, when God created the heavens and the earth, point to Christianity as its final aim and glorious issue. To this conception of Christianity in its relation to the world tend all the Christological, anthropological and cosmological ideas of the Bible.

The all-comprehensive scope which is thus claimed for Christianity, may at once be inferred from the central position in the universe, which is in the New Testament ascribed to Christ Himself. St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians are especially instructive in regard to this point. In these Epistles, as also elsewhere in the New Testament, there are disclosed to us glimpses of the heavenly glory of Christ, and we are permitted to behold Him in His cosmical relations as well as in His soteriological character.

We are here told, not only that we, whom God has predestinated unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ, have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace, but also that all things (*τὰ πάντα*) are comprehended together under one head in Christ. It was the object of the Father's good pleasure, which He eternally purposed in Himself, "with a view to (*εἰς*) the dispensation of the fulness of the times, to gather together in one (*rehead, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*) all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in Him." Eph. 1. 10. Hence He is afterwards represented as head over *all things*, as well as head of the Church. God has "raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him as head over all things to the Church (to be her head), which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Eph. 1. 20–23. These statements, it must be observed, do not refer simply to the preincarnate Logos, or to the divine nature of Christ, but to the whole historical God-man—the divine-human person, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, and rose again on the third day, and ascended into heaven. Christ as *God-man* is exalted to the right hand of God, above all the laws, forces, powers and ordinances of nature, as well as above all the orders, ranks, stations and dignities of angels; and the whole economy of creation stands at His disposal as the basis of His activity in behalf of the economy of the Church. This is no doubt what He Himself means when He says, as He is about to ascend into heaven: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." How, we may ask here by the way, could all this be, if the incarnation, the constitution of Christ's person, were a means only to an end beyond Christ Himself—an arrangement simply to make possible His atoning death? But again, He is declared to be "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; for by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, *and* *for Him.* And He is before all things, *and in Him all things consist.*" Col. 1. 15–17. "In Him all things consist"—He is the organizing, unifying principle of all things, in the presence and power of which they stand together (*συνέστηκε*) as parts of one harmonious whole, and without which they would fall asunder, as *disjecta membra*, into chaos and confusion. Hence it is said again: "It pleased the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of His cross, *by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself*—by Him, whether things in earth, or things in Heaven." Col. 1. 19–20.

The incarnation of the Son of God, and the unfolding of His mediatorial life in humanity affect, accordingly, not merely the human world, but also the angel-world as well as the nature-world—the whole cosmos. "The humanity of Jesus," says Eadie, "bringing all creatures around it, unites them to God in a bond which never before existed—a bond which has its origin in the mystery of redemption. Thus all things in heaven and earth feel the effects of man's renovation." The nature-world is renewed and glorified in and through Christ. This is true of the material heavens, as well as the material earth. St. John, in the vision of Patmos, saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first earth and the first heaven were passed away; and he heard Him that sat upon the throne saying: "Behold, I make *all things* new." The angelic world, on the other hand, is subordinated to humanity in Christ; not in such way, of course, that its own blessedness and glory are diminished, but in such way rather, that it is thereby brought to be nearer to God than it could otherwise have been, in consequence of which its blessedness and glory are positively enhanced. It is in this sense that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews explains the mysteriously significant language of the Eighth Psalm. "When I consider thy heavens," says the Psalmist here, "the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; what is man that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that thou visitest him?" In comparison with these vast and mighty works of God, of the character and extent of which modern science has revealed to us a great deal more than David could have known in his day, man in his present state appears as utterly insignificant. Nevertheless, the Psalmist continues: "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels," or as we might render it according to the original, "Thou madest him to lack but little of divinity—*Elohim*—and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet." Quoting these words of the Psalm, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, adds the significant statement: "For in that he put *all* in subjection under him, he left *nothing* that is not put under him." *Nothing*—therefore, not the angels, no order, rank or condition of being, whether rational or irrational, terrestrial, or celestial, visible or invisible—these are all put in subjection under *man*. Whatever man's present condition may be, and however insignificant he may appear to be in comparison with other creatures for the time being more highly endowed, it is nevertheless his glorious destiny to occupy the loftiest and most central position in the created universe. Unto the angels God has not put in subjection "the world to come," the world of perfection and glory as brought to pass by the manifestation and mediatorial life of Christ; that honor is reserved for man. "But *now*," the writer then continues, "we see not yet all things put under him." Humanity, in respect of its individual members, has not yet realized its appointed destiny. *Men* are still in a state of imperfectiom, of weakness and death. The forces of nature are still largely rebellious and refuse to yield obedience to their will; and the angelic world is still far above them. The angels, though appointed to be but "ministering spirits for them which shall be heirs of salvation," still excel these in power, in wisdom, in holiness and in glory. Therefore, "we do not yet see all things put under man," understanding by this term the single individuals, both living and dead, of which the human race is composed. But what do we see? The author answers, "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels on account of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor." In Jesus, the Second Adam, the destiny of humanity is generically and principially fulfilled. "Jesus Christ," we are told, "is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto Him." 1 Pet. iii. 22. And this glorification of the head of renewed humanity, or of the Church, involves necessarily a similar glorification of His members.

We are afraid sometimes to make full earnest with this thought.

We think of the vastness of the material creation, in comparison with which our little globe is only as a drop in the boundless ocean, or as the small dust that floats unnoticed in the sunbeam. And the innumerable worlds that fill the immensity of space, our imagination peoples with countless hosts of rational beings either like ourselves, or much more perfect and glorious than ourselves. And in view of the boundlessness of God's universe, and of the innumerable multitudes of glorious spirits who are busy in their Maker's praise and service, and who claim His care and love, we scarcely dare to think that we are of much account to Him. Yet we know that here, and in our nature, God has made the grandest display of His love, and wisdom, and power, that the angels ever beheld; a display, moreover, in which they themselves are most deeply interested, so that the "Gloria in *excelsis* Deo," first chanted on earth by the angelic host itself in the night of our Lord's nativity, has perhaps a higher meaning than may commonly be supposed. At any rate we have been made "to see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: *to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God.*" Eph. iii. 9–10. Here the Son of God, through whom and for whom all things were made, entered into personal union with His own creation. "The word was made *flesh*, and dwelt among *us*, and *we* beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." In this condescension to our nature, He passed by the angelic world. "He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham." And this discrimination in favor of humanity cannot be regarded otherwise than as being in accordance with the original aptitude and the eternal destiny of human nature. It cannot be supposed to have its motive solely in the fact that man is a sinner, and that his nature has become abnormal, and needs renovation; for some of the angels have sinned too. Hence it must be sought in the uniqueness of the nature and destiny of humanity as such. The nature of humanity is certainly unique, if only in consequence of its constitution of matter and spirit. With the exception of humanity, we know only of two grand orders of created being, namely, matter and spirit—the stars and the angels. The stars, as the spectroscope has now fully demonstrated, are composed essentially of the same elements of matter as our earth ; and if they differ from the earth at all, as no doubt they do, they differ only in regard to the manner in which these elements are united. Of the nature of the angels we know nothing except what we learn from revelation. And what revelation enables us to know concerning them is to the effect that they are incorporeal spirits. They are personal beings,[*] but not corporeal beings. There is no evidence in the Bible at all that they are now, or ever were, clothed in material bodies. But "corporeity is the end of God's ways ;" and that is found to exist properly only in humanity. There is no proof whatever, either in science or revelation, that there exists anywhere in the wide universe of God a race of beings similar to man in this regard. The process of creation seems to have unfolded itself at first mainly in a two-fold movement, giving rise to the world of spirit on the one side, and to the world of matter on the other, and then to have become one properly in the creation of man, whose being consists of matter and spirit organically united. And now in man the process returns back and becomes one with God by the incarnation of His Son, to the end that God may truly fill all things in all.[†] This seems to be the significance of humanity in the cosmos. It serves as the basis for the glorification of the cosmos by the actual, personal union with it of God.

---

[*] There may be a few passages of Scripture in which the term *angel* is used as a personification of some idea or force, but that does not prove that it is always so used, and that the angels as a class are merely *impersonal* beings. This is a point that needs no argument.

[†] "Indem die irdische Kreatur mit *der Gesammtheit* der Kreatursphären in volle Gemeinschaft tritt und zu einem Gesammtorganismus höchster Potenz konkrescirt kann Gott unbeschadet seines Verhältnisses *zu jeder einzelnen* von diesen besonderen Sphären sich in *allen* Kreisen der Schöpfung auf schlechthin reelle Weise sein Sein geben. *Sind die* (vollendeten) *Schöpfungssphären alle schlechthin in einander*, so entzieht er sich keiner von allen, indem er jede der übrigen an sich nimmt ; ja eben schon dadurch, dass er in *einer* sein Sein hat, hat er es unmittelbar zugleich auch in *allen übrigen*, sofern ja diese mit jenen in absoluter einheit stehen. Grade erst mit dieser endlosen (weil mit dem Fortgang der Schöpfung ins endlose wachsenden) Erweiterung der Sphäre der irdischen Kreatur vollendet sich das Sein Gottes in ihr, oder seine *menschwerdung schlechthin.* Denn erst bei ihr ist die *Menschliche* Form des Seins Gottes, ihrer specifisch menschlichen Bestimmtheit ungeachtet, eine schlechthin *unbeschränkte*, wie Gott seinem Begriff zufolge sie für sich fordern muss."—Rothe's *Theologische Ethik*, § 456.

By the incarnation and the economy of Christianity, our humanity is exalted and made more glorious than the nature of the angels, though in consequence of this their own glory must be supposed to be positively enhanced. And this is true not only of Christ Himself, who is "made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they," but also of His members. St. Paul says, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, *then shall ye also appear with Him in glory.*" Col. iii. 3–4.

And can it be supposed now, that we owe all this simply to the fact that we are sinners? Could and would the same glorious end not have been reached without sin? Are we rewarded for our apostasy and rebellion by being more highly exalted than we could otherwise have been? Must we look upon sin as the indispensable condition of this exaltation? Then truly may we join in the old exclamation with all our hearts: "O felix culpa Adami, quae meruit talem et tantum habere Redemptorem!" But it must be remembered that the manifestation of Christ in the fulness of time took place in consequence of an *eternal* decree or purpose of God, and not simply in consequence of a decree first formed after the historical occurrence of the fact of sin in the human world. For "He verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times" for those who by Him believe in God. 1. Pet. i. 20. Even the election of grace, according to which individual persons are chosen in Christ, antedates the foundation of the world, and must, therefore, be *eternal.* Eph. i. 4. The incarnation, accordingly, is not the execution of an afterthought on the part of God, conceived only after the fall of man, but the execution of an eternal purpose in the divine mind. It is, therefore, not contingent or accidental, but necessary and essential in God's eternal plan of the world. And if we are to conceive of it nevertheless as being conditioned solely by sin, so that without sin it could not have occurred, we must then consider sin also as being a necessity in God's eternal world-plan. In this case God must have willed sin in order that it might serve as an occasion for the revelation of His grace, and for the accomplishment of an end which could otherwise not have been attained. This is substantially the supralapsarian theory of sin and redemption—a theory to which it is commonly admitted that no objection can be made on the score of consistency or logic. There is only this great difficulty in regard to it, that sin ceases to be *sin* or *evil*, and becomes a substantial good. If God *wills* sin as the condition of a good which He could otherwise not have realized, then how can He seriously condemn it and punish it as evil? For, qualify and twist the matter as we may, we cannot, from this standpoint, escape the conclusion that God Himself is the real author of sin; and the creature which has come to be under its fatal power must be said to be *unfortunate* rather than *guilty*. Sin in this case is our *fate* rather than our *fault*—a fate pleasant enough, indeed, for those who are predestinated unto life, but most horrid for those who are not so predestinated. We are aware, indeed, of the exhortations and warnings by which some would check all thought in regard to the difficulties of this theory. The subject, we are told, is mysterious; and we now know only in part. God's decrees are inscrutable to our finite intelligence, and we ought not to seek to comprehend them by our feeble reason; for if we do, we are sure to go wrong. Sin may be the result of God's volition, and yet He may have a perfect right to punish it in the creature; that is, what is sin for the creature may not be sin for God. This may be incomprehensible to finite intelligence; but then finite intelligence is rudely reminded that it has no business to meddle with these deep things of God. We venture to think, however, that the notion which represents God as willing sin and yet being seriously angry with it and punishing it, must be incomprehensible to infinite intelligence no less than to that which is finite. If it is irreconcilable with our moral sentiments, we may be sure that it is still more irreconcilable with the moral sentiments of God. If we accept in its full meaning the idea that God is *holy*, and that the distinction between moral good and moral evil has any reality for Him, then we cannot admit in any sense that sin has its causality in God; and this is equivalent to saying that sin is in no sense a necessary element in God's conception of the world. The incarnation, however, is the unfolding in time of the central purpose of God's eternal counsels in regard to man and the world; and its actual occurrence can, therefore, not be conditioned simply by the actual existence of sin. We are thus brought to the proposition, which was once repudiated as impious and profane, but which has now gained the assent of the best modern theology: Etiam si homo non pecasset, Deus tamen incarnatus esset, licet non crucifixus. Even if man had not sinned, the Son of God would have become incarnate, not in order to be crucified, but in order to the complete self-revelation of God in the world, and in order to the full glorification of the world in God. This is more scriptural, certainly, and more agreeable to sound Christian feeling, than the thought that God decreed sin in order that it might be the means of accomplishing an end which otherwise He could not have accomplished. We thus recognize in the incarnation and in Christianity a world-completing, world-glorifying, as well as world-saving revelation of God, affecting in its operations and results the entire cosmos—the natural, the human and the angelic world. The economy of Christianity is, accordingly, the ultimate aim of God's eternal world-idea; the last stage of the world's developement, in which all lower stages are taken up and glorified; the last *age* (αἰών) of the world, in which the meaning of all the ages is unfolded, and through which the moving stream of the world's life is made to flow into the calm and endless ocean of eternity. This conclusion will be confirmed also by a brief consideration of the fundamental cosmogonic and cosmological ideas of Scripture.

The world, the cosmos, according to the Bible, is not to be regarded as a system of things brought into existence by a single stroke of divine omnipotence, and therefore complete and finished in all its parts from the beginning. This would be substantially the error of Deism, according to which God, indeed, created the world once, but now stands above it in sublime indifference, after the manner of the gods of Epicurus, while the world moves on like a machine, with unvarying monotony, in consequence of the operation of certain fixed and unchangeable laws or forces, which were inherent in it from the first moment of its existence. Nor is the world to be regarded as being made up of an infinite series of blind, automatic or spontaneous movements and processes, without beginning or end, without meaning or design, according to the notion of Pantheism. The Biblical or Christian conception of the world excludes the errors of both these views, while it includes the truth involved in each, namely the idea of creation underlying the former, and the idea of progressive developement underlying the latter

The world is an organic system unfolding itself gradually according to a divine thought or plan, and under the impulse of the divine will. The process of its genesis consists of a series of creative epochs, each of which becomes the foundation of an *aeon* or age of development, in which the new principles and potencies of the creative epoch are unfolded. The ages following each other, not blindly, but according to a divine plan, are teleologically related to each other, one always preparing the way for, and demanding that which follows it in order to the fulfillment of its own design and meaning. In each, moreover, the contents of those which have preceded it are taken up and transfigured into new and higher forms of existence, not by the evolution of latent germs which previous ages may be supposed to have carried in themselves, but by the operation of those higher principles and forces which distinguish every new age from all that have gone before. The number or series of the ages is not infinite, but definite and determinate; so that, as there was a first age, there is also a last age, in which the divine idea of the world is fully actualized. This last age, beginning with the commencement of the Christian economy, is in the New Testament called "the world to come" (*ὁ ἀίὼν μὲλλων*) in the sphere and by the powers of which the whole previous order of the world, which is commonly designated by the term "this world" (*ὁ αἰὼν οὖτοδ*), is to be transfigured and glorified. "This world," accordingly, embracing both nature and humanity, has its end in "the world to come," or in Christianity.

In regard to this subject of aionic progression, or gradual development in the organism of the world, the science of Geology has brought to light an array of facts, which Theology will do well to consider and make account of. While the utterances of Deistic theologians in regard to the "eternal constancy of nature" sometimes remind us of the notions of those mockers, who say "that all things have remained as they were from the beginning of the creation," Geology has long since rested in the conviction that the world has passed through a succession of periods and stages, in all of which the laws of nature and the entire state of things on the earth were very different from what they are at present. There was first a mineral age, of very long duration, when the highest forces at work in the system of nature were those which are controlled by the laws of chemical affinity and combination and of crystallization. Next there came an age when the earth was clothed with vegetation exceeding in luxuriance anything of which we have any conception now, and when animal life in great abundance began to make its appearance in the waters of the ocean. This again was followed by an age of reptiles and birds, and that by an age of mammalian animals. Thus in Geology we have positive scientific proof "that all things have *not* remained as they were from the beginning of the creation." Each geological age was an advance upon all that preceded it, in consequence of the operation of new energies and forces, new principles and laws, that were wanting in every preceding age. These ages, moreover, though their length cannot be exactly determined by any modern measurement of time, are yet certainly known to have been of very long duration—a duration that can probably be expressed only in millions of years. And there is abundant evidence too, that one age did not fade into another quietly and silently, in consequence of a gradual transmutation of its contents, but that each had a distinct beginning as well as end. Between the azoic and the paleozoic ages, for example, there exists a well-marked line of separation, indicating a comparatively sudden close of the one and an equally sudden beginning of the other. And so again between the paleozoic and the mesozoic, and between the mesozoic and the cainozoic, as well as between the successive periods or subdivisions of which these long ages were composed. But while one age did not proceed forth from another in the way of a gradual transformation of its contents, still the contents of each lower one are taken up and preserved in the higher, and transfigured by the presence and power of higher principles and laws. The contents of the earlier ages are not left behind or annihilated by the later ones, but retained and made to serve as material for the formation and development of the contents of these later ones. The elements and laws of the mineral kingdom, for example, are taken up into the constitution of the vegetable; but they are here met by the higher laws of organic life, by which they are made to enter into combinations and to give rise to forms of existence which the forces of the mineral kingdom as such are unable to produce. We may say, therefore, that the mineral kingdom is *glorified* in the vegetable, and the vegetable as well as the mineral in the animal, while all these together are taken up and glorified in the human—the world of mind and history, to which the whole world-process pointed from the beginning as its relative completion and end.

Such is the teaching of natural science in regard to the constitution of the present system of the world, and in regard to its genesis, or the manner of its formation. And such is also the teaching of the Bible. The Mosaic account of the creation represents the world as finished, not in a single instant of time, but in six days. These creative days are undoubtedly to be regarded as periods or ages of unknown duration, in the course of which were unfolded and developed the new principles and powers of the creative epochs, in which the successive days or periods had their beginning. At the close of the sixth day, when the fulness of the time had come and all things were ready, God created man in His own image and after His own likeness, and appointed him to have dominion over all the earth. With the appearance of humanity, as we have just intimated, the world-process came to its relative completion; for it is now "this world" in its pure conception and essential constitution. In man the whole creation is summed up and recapitulated. "Man," says J. H. Fichte, "occupies a point in which all created things cross each other," and "in him all the powers of the world are united."* By physiologists it is considered an established fact that all the chemical elements which enter into the constitution of the earth are, without a single exception, found also in the constitution of the human body. The laws of vegetable and animal life, moreover, are found to prevail also in the physical life of man; the vegetative system of the plant having its representative in the nutritive system of the human body, whose organs perform their functions automatically like those of the plant, while the muscular and nervous systems of the animal have their representatives in the corresponding systems of the human body. This shows how intimately man is related to the system of nature beneath him, and how all its forces and elements are concentrated in his constitution. But man is not only a creature of earth, an epitome of the whole material creation, but also of the spiritual. "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty

---

*See Rothe's *Theologische Ethik*, § 2, where the fact that the whole creation is recapitulated in man, both really and ideally, is assumed as the ground of the possibility of an *a priori* or speculative construction by the human mind of the *science* of the whole creation.

giveth him understanding." He is in a peculiar sense the "offspring (*γένος*) of God." He is an epitome of the whole material and spiritual creation—a *microcosm* of the *macrocosm*. And now with man at its head, the whole world of nature has passed beyond itself, and has become material for the world of mind, of freedom, of history. And this entire system of things, comprehending all departments and orders of being which enter into the constitution of the present organism of the world, and having its animating, unifying, and all-controlling principle in man, is what in the sacred Scriptures, is called *this world* or *this aeon*. *This world*, accordingly, is the aeon of humanity, beginning with the creation of Adam and being still in course of development.

But the æon of humanity is not yet the final æon in the historical development of the world as a whole; it is not yet the last sense and meaning of the world. On the contrary this æon as such, even without reference to the disorder which has come to prevail in it, implies "the coming aeon," (*ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων*), as the form in which its own idea shall be fully actualized. "According to Genesis," says Lange, "every thing is created through the idea of man in the image of God with a view to this man; according to the New Testament it is through the idea of Christ, who is the principle of humanity, with a view to Christ. As Adam was the principle of the creation, so is Christ the principle of humanity. Therefore it is said: 'God hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world.' The creation is, in its most essential point, the production of the eternal God-man in the eternal to-day. . . . . . The beautiful cosmos, this unity of all varieties, which combines in it an endless complex of unities, has, in Christ, the most beautiful of the children of men, its middle point, the centre of its ideal beauty. Finally, the first æon, which is fixed by the life of Adam, has for its core, its root, and its aim, the second æon fixed by Christ."* This seems to be nothing more than what St. Paul means when he says: "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural (*psychical*, *ψυχικόν*) and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as in the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." 1 Cor. xv. 45–48. There seems to be no particular reference here to the contrast of sin and redemption, but simply to the contrast of nature and spirit as manifested in Adam and Christ respectively. The first Adam, though made a living soul by the inspiration of the divine breath of life, was nevertheless of the earth, and therefore *earthy* (χοικός), this idea being expressed also in the name *Adam* (from *adamah*, *earth*), which in Hebrew is a generic name for man. He possessed a material organism, which being taken from the earth, retained still to a large extent the properties and qualities of an earthly substance. It was affected, for instance, by the laws of gravity in the same way that all matter is affected. It needed material nourishment, food and drink, in order to its preservation. It was subject to waste, and carried in itself the possibility of disease and death. The chemical forces which pervaded it had power to work its decay and dissolution, in case they were not counteracted and held in check by the superior power of healthy vitality residing in the soul. And it was, therefore, not yet an adequate vehicle for the soul. This state, however, was not one of positive evil, but only of relative imperfection—a lower stage of development, which was destined to pass away in a higher, through communion with the heavenly life of the Second Adam. For "as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." The *chöic* character of humanity, as existing in Adam and derived from him to his posterity, was not destined to last always, but to be exchanged for the spiritual character of humanity as glorified in Christ. In Christ we see human nature no longer in a *chöic*, but in a spiritual state. The human body of Christ has, indeed, not ceased to be material, but it has ceased to be controlled by the laws and forces of earthly matter, and has become subject absolutely to the control of the spirit. The laws of gravity and the laws of chemical action and reaction have lost their force in consequence of the presence and absolute predominance of the laws of spiritual life. To a limited extent, indeed, the ordinary laws and forces of matter are checked and held in abeyance by the power of the soul's life in our present natural state. When a man, for example, only raises his arm by an act of volition, he suspends for the time the operation of the force of gravity. When a man abstains from food for forty days without suffering an injury, this shows that there is a fountain of life in his higher spiritual nature, which may for a time sustain the body and lift it above its ordinary need of food. But these are examples only which serve to give us some faint idea of that state in which the spirit shall have obtained perfect mastery over the body and freed it from all the conditions of elementary nature—a state which we see realized in Christ, to some extent before, but completely only after His resurrection. And for this spiritual state or mode of existence, and for an order of the world corresponding to it, man was destined from the beginning. How the change from the *chöical* to the spiritual would have been brought to pass, in case man had not sinned, we are not now able fully to understand. No doubt the tree of life in Paradise was appointed with a reference to this change; still the power of its realization could have proceeded only from that Second Adam, or "quickening Spirit," who is the principle of humanity, and with a view to whom humanity was created. It was, therefore, the destiny of humanity from the beginning to be perfected and glorified in Christianity.

---

*See Lange's Commentary on Genesis. Page 178.

But man has not continued in that state of sinlessness in which he was created. He has become a sinner. His whole being is disordered. He is now not only *chöical*, but also *carnal*. Death, which was originally only a possibility, has now become a terrible reality. And this disorder, which has its origin in the spiritual nature of man, extends to the whole economy of "this world," whose central principle is in man. All the powers and forces, whether spiritual, moral, mental or physical, which enter into the organic movement of the æon of humanity, have felt the corrupting, perverting, disintegrating influence of moral evil; and hence the entire process of this aeon, its whole development, is disordered and abnormal. For this reason the expression "this world," as used in Scripture, always carries in itself a reference to the idea of moral corruption, of estrangement from God, of ungodliness and sin. According to St. Paul (2. Cor. iv. 4), Satan, who is the enemy of God and His works, and who stands at the head of the kingdom of evil, is the god or governing principle of "this world;" and our Lord (John xii. 31), calls Satan the archon or "ruler of this world," *τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*; which last term is frequently used, especially in the writings of St. John; but also, though less frequently elsewhere in the New Testament, as equivalent to the phrase *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος* with the ethical sense of evil attaching to it." "The whole world," says St. John, "lieth in the wicked one." Therefore the world stands in hostile opposition to God, hates Christ, and persecutes Christians. The Scriptural terms "this world" and "this age," accordingly, denote not simply an incomplete or immature stage in the process of the world's development. This idea is generally involved in them; but along with this goes always the notion of an enstrangement from the life of God through sin, and of a consequent perversion of all its elements, principles and powers. The world is *profane.* Its profaneness, however, is not an essential quality, inseparable from its substance, but an accidental disease from which it is to be delivered.

Now "the world to come," in distinction from the present world, is the new aeon, beginning with the appearance of Christ; and its contents (besides the contents of the present aeon, which are gradually taken up into it), are the spiritual principles and powers proceeding from Christ and permanently embodied in the constitution of the Church, which is, therefore, said to be the pleroma or fulness of Christ. This world and the world to come are not related in such way that the beginning of the latter involves the annihilation or even the immediate cessation of the former. As the mineral kingdom did not come to an end when the vegetable kingdom was created, but was reduced to the grade of serving as basis and material for the development of the latter, so the aeon of Adam did not cease with the beginning of the Christian aeon, but continued still to run its course, though bearing in its bosom the supernatural life of the Christian aeon as the principle of its own regeneration and glorification. The parable of the leaven may be taken as offering an illustration of the manner in which the elements of "this world" are to be transformed and glorified by the operation of the "powers of the world to come." As the leaven hid in the meal silently communicates its own qualities and properties to the entire mass, so as gradually to effect its transformation; so does the life-power of the Christian economy, coming down from heaven and lodging itself in the bosom of the economy of the present world, communicate its heavenly qualities and properties to the nature and elements of this world, until at last this world shall be entirely renewed and glorified. In this way the *disorder* of "this world," is removed, and its *proper substance* elevated, transfigured and glorified in the sphere and by the operation of "the powers of the world to come." The two results, however, are the effect of one process. The economy of Christianity effects the deliverance of the world from its disorder and corruption, because it effects the exaltation and glorification of the world. The æon of *man* was, according to the divine idea of it, designed from the beginning to be swallowed up and glorified in the æon of the *God-man.* The *history* of the first æon does not correspond to the divine idea and will. The whole development of this æon is abnormal, and instead of tending always towards the kingdom of God, as it ought to do, it tends only to evil. Still in the fulness of time the new æon of the God-man comes in according to the divine purpose, and joins itself to the previous æon of man in such way that the glorification of this latter is also at once its deliverance from disorder and corruption. The two results are in each other, and the one necessarily implies the other.

The disorder of sin, as we have already seen, has taken possession of all departments and orders of existence pertaining to this world. First and chiefly, it affects man in his whole constitution, involving both soul and body. The life of the soul in its isolation from God is diseased and abnormal, and the activities of all its faculties and powers are perverted. It, therefore, needs regeneration—reunion with God—the coming into it of a principle of new and spiritual life from Christ by the Holy Ghost. The body is diseased and subject to death and dissolution. It, therefore, needs to be delivered from the power of corruption; and this is promised to it in the resurrection of the last day, which will be the glorious issue of the process commenced in regeneration. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." In this last contrast we have a confirmation of what we have said above in regard to the fundamental identity of deliverance and glorification. Man was originally made with a natural body, which was designed, however, to become spiritual. But instead of advancing towards the spiritual, it became corruptible in consequence of the soul's alienation from the life of God. And now through the economy of redemption "this corruptible" is to be put off; but the result will be at once something more than "the natural" which existed in the beginning. It is raised, not a natural, but a spiritual body. The deliverance from the power of corruption, and the glorification of the natural into the spiritual are brought to pass by one and the same act.

But the disorder of sin affects, besides the soul and body of man, also the whole body of nature; and this, therefore, likewise waits to be delivered fromthe bondage of corruption. "The whole creation," according to St. Paul, "groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now;" and it must continue to do so until the time of the glorious manifestation of the sons of God. We do not believe, however, that this is to be understood to mean that a positive deterioration occurred in the body of nature, that its essential laws and forces suffered a change for the worse, at or after the time of man's fall. It is obvious, of course, that the present state of the world corresponds to the present state of man; so that the world may be said with truth to be in a fallen condition. To consider the present form of the world as the best possible, so that its manifest evils would have to be regarded only as blessings in disguise, would involve a theory of optimism that does not satisfy our ideas of perfection. It is further obvious that nature sympathizes most profoundly with man, and with his intellectual and moral condition. It is well known to how large an extent the climate and the productions of any region of the earth are dependent upon human culture. In countries inhabited by savage men, who do not cultivate the soil, but live by war and the chase, nature grows savage too. Germany, in the time of Tacitus, was a land of impenetrable marshes and forests, in which the snow did not melt during eight months of the year. And when Julius Cæsar invaded Britain, his soldiers suffered much more from the deadly influence of the climate than from the arrows and spears of the naked savages that inhabited the land. The improvement which has taken place in the soil and climate of these countries has been due to the intellectual and moral elevation of their inhabitants. All this we can understand. But when Milton says that when Eve plucked the forbidden fruit:—

> "Earth felt the wound, and Nature from her seat,
> Sighing through all her works, gave signs of woe
> That all was lost,"

while, of course, we acknowledge the beauty of the poetry, and also the deep truth which it involves, yet we cannot but read it *cum grano salis.* For while there is in nature now a constant tendency to degeneration, and while the want of proper cultivation induces at once a rude and savage condition—the growth of thorns and thistles instead of the nobler plants, a change of climate from more mild to more severe, the formation of swamps and morasses, from which are exhaled pestilential vapors and deadly miasmata, yet all this was so also before man had made his appearance on the earth. There was a long age when the earth was merely a glowing fire-ball; another, when it was surrounded by an envelope of steam, which no light of the sun or stars ever penetrated; and still another, when the atmosphere was so charged with carbonic acid that no human being could have breathed in it and lived. There were ages of long duration when the heat was so intense, and others when the cold was so severe, that no living beings constituted as we are could have existed here at all. The earth as a whole was no genial paradise at any time previous to the age of man. The Paradise in which man had his first home, though larger than an ordinary garden, was still of very small dimensions in comparison with the entire surface of the earth; and it was the product of a special divine culture and care. "The Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there He put the man whom He had formed." This garden man was commanded "to dress and to keep," and the earth he was commanded "to replenish and *subdue.*" Paradise was the beginning of glorification for the earth, corresponding to the intellectual, and moral, and physical condition of man in the state of innocence; and it was, no doubt, the divine plan that, from that initial point, the whole earth was to be "subdued" by the agency of man, and converted into the paradisaic state. Had man preserved his sinlessness and kept the garden, the whole earth would have advanced towards its glorification in the same proportion as man would have advanced towards his; though the end could undoubtedly have been reached only in the age and under the reign of the Second Adam. But instead of subduing the earth, man lost the garden itself, and God cursed the *ground*, the Eden-soil, so that that also fell back into the condition which still characterized the earth at large, and forthwith began to bring forth thorns and thistles. And *now* the earth is not in a condition answering to its divine idea—the condition it would be in if man's development had been normal; and this incongruity between the ideal and the real is felt as an evil, and causes the groaning and travailing of every creature.

But this incongruity between the ideal and the real state of nature is destined to pass away and disappear in the sphere of "the world to come." The defects of nature are to be healed by the coming into it of the supernatural, with its transforming and glorifying power. The creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The process of glorification, arrested by the fall and disobedience of the first Adam, is resumed and consummated in the reign of the second Adam. When this process shall be complete, the difference between the ideal and the real will be done away, and the world will shine in perfect beauty; and only then will the idea and plan of the cosmos be fully actualized. Of what the glorified earth will be we have some glimpses in the miracles of the Gospel. The change of water into wine, the multiplication of bread in the wilderness, the walking on the water, the calming of the storm, and similar phenomena in the life of Christ,* are momentary manifestations of the ideal or glorified order of nature, showing what nature will be at the full maturity of the new aeon, of whose beginning they are signs and exhibitions. We believe that we have here the proper ground for the right explanation of the Christian miracles. Miracles have frequently been defined and treated as events brought to pass by the almighty will of God, in the violation of the established order of the world, for the purpose of authenticating the divine mission and truthfulness of the organs of revelation. The evangelical miracles were, accordingly, designed simply to convince the world of the heavenly origin of Christ, and of the truth of His doctrines. Under this view they are often made to figure prominently in works on the evidences of Christianity. The truth of Christianity is to be demonstrated even to unbelievers by means of the miracles performed by Christ and recorded in the New Testament. But it may well be made a question whether any body was ever convinced of the truth of Christianity in this way. The Jews who *saw* the miracles of Christ with their own eyes evidently were not. When Jesus had raised Lazarus from the dead, the Sanhedrim did not pretend to deny the event; but, while acknowledging that "this man was doing many miracles," they resolved to put Him to death, that He might do no more. And there is no evidence in the New Testament at all that Christ performed His miracles with the purpose of demonstrating His claim to be the Son of God, and of convincing His opponents. When the Jews demanded of him a sign from heaven, He answered them, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it, except the sign of the prophet Jonas." The miracles of Christ, then, are not to be regarded as arbitrary displays of omnipotence, or outward, mechanical interferences with the established order and course of the world, for the purpose of catching attention and captivating the minds of men, but organic manifestations of the life and power of the new creation in Christ, having their end, therefore, in themselves. They are not violations of the laws of nature, but rather beginnings of the deliverance and glorification of nature. They are supernatural, inasmuch as they are not the product of the operation of the laws and forces of the present unfinished system of nature, and contranatural, too, in the sense of being contrary to the present actual condition of nature, which is itself contrary to its own ideal, but at the same time also in the highest sense natural, because in perfect harmony with the eternal ideal of nature.* The plant is supernatural in reference to the mineral kingdom, because it is the product of a power above the plane of that kingdom. But there is no violence done to the nature of the mineral kingdom. when its elements are taken up and transfigured by the principle of life in the organism of the plant; for its own inherent idea requires it to be used in this way, as is evident, for example, from its own *effort* at organization in the crystal. The mineral kingdom contains prophetic intimations of the vegetable, and this of the animal, and this finally of the human; and the higher, though supernatural in reference to the lower, yet involves no violation of the nature of the lower. But the whole world is a prophecy of Christ, and points to the kingdom of Christ as its own ultimate aim and end. And how then could the kingdom of Christ, by the operation of the forces and powers peculiar to it, offer any violence to the essential order of the world? The world must, according to its own idea and destiny, yield itself as basis and material for the kingdom of Christ; and in being thus appropriated, it suffers no violence, but attains to its own glorification. But the kingdom of Christ, or as the Evangelists commonly call it, the kingdom of Heaven, is at hand in Christ Himself. See Math. iii. 2. He is the source of all its forces and powers; and His miracles, or as St. John generally calls them, His *works*, are therefore the first acts of the process by which "He is making all things new;" the beginnings of the deliverance of the creation from the bondage of corruption, and of that glorification which is required in order to the realization of God's eternal idea of the world. Or we may say that the Christian miracles, including the miracle of the incarnation itself, as the principle from which they all proceed, are those creative acts by which the kingdom of Heaven is established, or by which the foundation is laid of that new æon or world, in the sphere and by the powers of which "this world" is destined to attain its proper end and glorification. This we suppose is to be the essential meaning of miracles; and whatever apologetic force they have we regard as merely incidental.

---

* Christ is the centre and principle of *all* miracles, of those of the Old Testament, and of those of the Apostolic age, no less than of those performed immediately by Himself. Of those of the Apostolic age this is plain at once, for they were performed "in the name of Jesus." But it is true also of those of the Old Testament, for they could not have occurred if *Christ had not been coming*. As the dawn precedes the sun, though it has its cause in the sun and could not be if the sun were not rising—so the miracles of the Old Testament are related to the coming of Christ.

---

*See Lange's Commentary on Matthew, page 154.

The question is often discussed, sometimes with a polemical design, whether miracles have absolutely ceased in the Church, and if so, at what precise period of time. The answer to this question will depend, of course, upon the view which is taken of the essence and design of miracles; and we believe that what has now been said on this subject offers the key to a correct solution of it. Now it is no doubt true that genuine miracles occurred in the post-Apostolic age of the Church. Church history points to no precise period when it may be said that here miracles came to an end. But on the other hand it also true that the mass of the monkish miracles of the Middle Ages, and of the Jesuitical miracles of more modern times, are so unlike the genuine miracles of the New Testament that they do not deserve to be ranked in the category of miracles at all. The *display* of miraculous power, in the form in which it attended the advent of the new aeon in Christ, seems to have become less striking, until finally it disappeared altogether after the Church had taken firm possession of the life of the world. Still the Church, as the pleroma of Christ, the organism in which "the powers of the world to come" are permanently embodied, must continuously carry in her constitution the essence of the supernatural life and power, from which the miraculous or wonderful phenomena of her foundation period proceeded. The substance of miraculous power must remain in the Church always, though it is active no longer in the extraordinary form which characterized the first period of the Church's history. The power of life by which the vegetable kingdom propagates itself in its own order, is the same as that by which it was originally called into existence. When a seed germinates in the soil and develops itself into a plant, we behold the working of the same power by which the earth was made to bring forth the first plant of the kind in the beginning; and yet we no longer call this a miracle. While the vegetable kingdom is a continuous miracle in reference to the mineral kingdom which is beneath it, yet in the ongoing of its life now it is perfectly natural. Here that which was at first miraculous, and which is always supernatural in reference to that which is beneath it, has now, in respect of itself, become natural. And in the same sense we may say that the supernatural life of the new creation in Christ has become natural in the constitution of the the Church. The possibility of miracles must, therefore, be supposed to be always at hand in the Church; and this possibility may be expected also to actualize itself whenever the Church comes in conflict with the world in new forms or on new grounds, as for example, when she goes forth in earnest to the conquest of new or heathen lands; and it will be actualized, no doubt, on a grand scale in the last great conflict, when the Christian æon shall break through the shell of the old æon, in which it is now inclosed, and when all things shall be made new.

Meanwhile, however, the supernatural, or miraculous, or world-subduing and world-glorifying power is not latent or dormant in the church. It is active, but in a natural, historical form. For, while the power of the Gospel is gradually accomplishing the moral and spiritual regeneration of the world, Christian humanity is also constantly gaining more dominion over the earth. Christian science and art, for example, are more and more bridling the rude forces of nature and making them tributary to the well-being of man. The winds, and the waves, and the lightnings of heaven, are governed and made to do the bidding of him who was ordained to be their master. Man is learning more and more to "subdue" the earth. Christian science and Christian charity are healing diseases, curing the cripple, giving sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, and teaching the lame to walk. It may be said that all these are activities merely of the natural mind, and that they belong essentially to the domain of the present world. In one sense we may grant this. And we may grant more. The scientist who studies the laws of nature in order to their mastery, the mechanic who builds a locomotive and the engineer who drives it, the man who operates the telegraph, the farmer who cultivates the soil most skillfully, the physician who understands his art most thoroughly and is most successful in the healing of diseases, the man who founds asylums for the blind, the deaf and the dumb, and he who teaches the blind to read, and the deaf and the dumb to speak—*all* these may not be Christian men; but it is true, nevertheless, that all these things are done only in Christian lands and under the impulse which is derived from Christianity. Ancient heathenism and modern heathenism have nothing of the kind to show. We might, indeed, be reminded here of the ancient Greek and Roman civilization, and of the achievements made in philosophy, in science, in literature, and in art on the part of those nationalities previously to the advent of Christianity. But how different after all was that civilization from modern Christian civilization—how barbaric and inhuman in comparison with this! And how meagre were the achievements of the Greek and Roman mind in comparison with the achievements of the modern Christian mind! And yet the Greek and Roman mind had done its utmost—the utmost probably that the human mind can do when left to its own resources simply—and was already in process of decay, giving no promise of anything more, when the light of Christianity dawned upon it. The activities of science, of art and of charity which distinguish the modern Christian world, and by which the condition of mankind is so much improved, must then be said to be in some way due to Christianity. Misdirected, misapplied and perverted as these activities often are, they have their origin, nevertheless, in the new light which Christianity has kindled in the human mind and in the heavenly philanthropy which it has awakened in the human heart. Even the Tyndalls, the Huxleys and Spencers are possible only in a Christian land, and owe the very powers of their individual minds only to the long training which the general national mind, in which they are comprehended, has received under the tuition of the church. They may not know this, and may ungratefully be engaged in undermining the Christian faith; but then they are like the man who is foolishly engaged in cutting away the support from under his own feet. But while there are unbelieving scientists, who change into darkness the very light that is in them, still the true masters of science are now, and always have been, true and devout Christians. And we believe, therefore, that we are right in claiming the dominion over the powers of this world, which man has in these last times achieved by the aid of science and art, as a general result of the working of the supernatural powers of the Church.

Still we can see no prospect in all this of a gradual development of the world into that millennial glory for which the creation is unconsciously groaning and waiting, and for which the sons of God are consciously longing and hoping. We may regard it as a prophecy of the glorification which will be brought to pass at the end of this old world-æon, and as a preparation of the way for it; but the fulfillment can only come in consequence of a new exertion of the supernatural powers of the world to come, in a form and on a scale of which we can now form no adequate conception at all. The glorification of the world, comprehending not only the material earth, but also the material heavens, which is the aim of the Christian economy, and which will be of such transcendent interest and importance both to men and angels, will be the result of a *catastrophe* such as the universe has never yet experienced. So much may be inferred from the language of our Lord's great eschatological discourse: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days (which precede the coming of the end) shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken" (a giving way, perhaps, of the law of gravitation). St. Peter also testifies that "in the day of the Lord the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." The catastrophe, however, will not involve an annihilation of the material heavens and of the material earth, but their transformation rather and glorification. For "we according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." Of that new cosmical state, towards which all the æons from the foundation of the world are tending, and which will endure *εις τοῦς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, we can now perhaps form no adequate conception, and it would be vain, therefore, to speculate concerning it. It is enough to know that, being thus transformed and glorified, the earth will be the centre from which God's glory will stream forth into the entire cosmos, in a way that was never realized before, and that man, redeemed and glorified through participation of the divine nature in Christ, will dwell as the priest of creation in the inmost sanctuary of God's great temple. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God."

Art. III.—THE OLD LECTIONARIA OF THE CHURCH, AND THE BREVIARY.

Great interest of late has been shown in efforts to secure a systematic study of the Bible in the various Sunday-schools of the Church. Such interest is certainly commendable. The Christian Church cannot neglect the Holy Scriptures. They testify of Christ, who is Himself the source and substance of Christianity, and whom to know aright is life and peace. The living presence of Christ by the Spirit in the Church, can never be separated from His presence as historically revealed, and as accredited by those who were eye and ear witnesses of his self-revelation in the flesh, without lapsing into vague, subjective mysticism. Nor can the record given by those who were with Him as incarnate be disconnected from the antecedent prophecy and discipline which opened the way for His coming in such form. Neither record in fact can be fully intelligible except as we recognize the identity of the Word made flesh with the Jehovah who spake to the fathers. Without this wholeness of the record thus centering in Jesus, and becoming unto us, by our union with Him in His kingdom, spirit and life, everything comes to take a magic, unhistorical, and even immoral character, and we fail to apprehend Christ as the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and end of all religious history.

It is not strange, then, that the Church should take a deep interest in the study of the Bible, especially in these days, when the *world which now is* engrosses so much attention, and when there seems to be great danger of excluding the supernatural entirely from thought, and of setting aside the whole mystery of a self-revelation of God, such as challenges our regard throughout the Holy Scriptures, from Genesis to the Apocalypse.

We could wish, indeed, that the interest of which we speak should not confine itself to systematizing the study of the Bible for the young alone, but that attention should be given as well to the proper method of presenting the truth and fulness of the divine revelation from the pulpit. System here, we believe, is even more necessary than in the Sunday-school, and will of itself do much to further the work there, and give to it proper and permanent force.

If the sermonizing of the pulpit is made from week to week throughout the year to traverse at random the whole field of Scripture, changing with every changing circumstance or accident of the times, or with every passing caprice of the pulpit orator, so-called, and carrying along with it prayers and hymns and music, which perforce are all swept into the same unsteady and muddy current, how can we expect any stable or satisfactory system to reach down into the Sunday-school, and become effective there? It were well, therefore, we think, if they who are at present struggling with the important problem of introducing systematic weekly Bible-lessons among the young, would take the whole subject into earnest consideration, and see if the minister, as well as Sunday-school teacher, does not need some centralizing principle under the guidance of which he may present the mystery of Divine Revelation to his people.

We wish to call the attention of those who are interested in the general subject now introduced, to what has been done in this direction by the early Church. We do not suppose that any now will be fully satisfied with results reached centuries ago;. yet it is well to examine the past, and ascertain if we can the principle which regulated the method then pursued in presenting lessons of Scripture from week to week through the year. We may find the principle a correct one, and such as should guide all selections of the kind, and yet see that it may be more fully and consistently carried out now than it was then; or we may reject the principle as false, and substitute another more correct, and reconstruct the whole anew. Under any view, an examination of the kind will not be labor lost. It may stimulate inquiry, and perhaps aid in saving us from the sad confusion of a selection which has no principle or order whatever.

The merest glance at the old Lectionaria will show that they all agree in this, viz: *that the selections of Scripture to be read and meditated upon are immediately and as far as possible connected with the whole church service.* That is, the mysterious fact of Divine Revelation with which any given season of the church year has to do, and which underlies hymns and prayers, determines the Scripture-lesson also. All seem bound together organically; and hence at quite an early period we find the various elements of the service joined together in one compendium, called *Breviarium*, including Scripture-lessons, texts, psalms, hymns, collects, antiphons, responses, and indeed all the various parts of the church service. However imperfect may be the fragments of the oldest Lectionaria, they are seen to be methodized after the pattern of the church-year; and the great redemptive mysteries taken up by the festivals crystallize around themselves definite sections of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments.*

The two oldest Lectionaria which have come down to us at all complete are the so-called "Liber Comitis," and the "Lectionarium Gallicanum," both of which are before us as we write; the first, in Migne's edition of St. Jerome, Tom. XI. 407, and the second, in Mabillon's "De Liturgia Gallicana," Lib. II. 106. The "Liber Comitis" is attributed, without sufficient evidence, to St. Jerome. Its great antiquity, however, is beyond all question; and it may be safely regarded as one of the oldest collections of Scriptural lessons assigned for the church-year. The text given by Migne is from a revision of the original work by a presbyter named Theuting, who lived in the ninth century. The Lect. Gall. is probably not so ancient as the original Lib. Com. It was written without much doubt in the early period of the Merovingian dynasty. Mabillon, no mean authority, says of it: "Haud scio an ullum sit Lectionarium hoc Gallicano antiquius; si fortè excipias librum Comitis, indicantem lectiones ad usum ecclesiæ Romanæ."

We propose to examine the two in connection, only giving a sketch of the lessons immediately surrounding the great festivals, and endeavoring to state the ground of the same. We shall confine ourselves also to the selections from the Old Testament, as time forbids any detail, and the pericopes will sufficiently indicate the nature of the New Testament selections.

Both lectionaria alike begin with the Christmas festival—"in vigilia natalis Domini." No mention is made of Advent. In the ancient period, the season preceding Christmas was not definitely fixed as now with its four Advent Sundays. It was a general season of preparation for Christmas, not uniformly determined as to length, being a fast varying from four to six weeks. In the ancient Gallican Church the Advent season, under this general character, began with the feast of St. Martin, November 11th, the period between this and Christmas being called St. Martin's Lent. The Lect. Gall. probably began here; for the extant copy is mutilated, several services (six at least) being torn away from the beginning, as is evident from the notation preceding the first lesson, which is VIII. instead of I.*

---

* "Atque ita, licet perfectum Lectionarium ex antiquitate non habeamus traditum, persuasi tamen sumus, lectionem scripturarum ad certum methodum et regulas, praesertim in majoribus solemnitatibus ac diebus festis ecclesiæ, fieri consuevisse." Bingham, as quoted by Augusti.

The selections in the Lib. Com. for the opening Christmas festival are the following: Isaiah lxi.–lxii.; ix. 2-7; lii. 6-11, and xliv. 23 to the end of xlvi., probably with omissions. In the Lect. Gall. the selections for the vigil of Christmas are, Isaiah liv. to lvi. 7, and Malachi iii.–iv.; and for Christmas, Isaiah vii. 10 to ix. 8 with certain omissions.

Now a moment's examination of these lessons will at once show that the season of Advent, including Christmas, gathered to itself from the Old Testament, and most appropriately also, selections from those prophecies which most distinctly take into vision the coming of the Lord. This is the Christmas element of the Old Testament. It was just this element that determined the tone of the whole Church service in hymns and psalms, and prayers, and collects, and homilies, and the scriptural lessons could not be otherwise without breaking that harmony of thought and meditation which the Church desired. It is not our purpose here to determine critically how well the task was executed in the selections. All we wish to do is to indicate as briefly as possible what principle guided it. We cannot forbear remarking, however, that the same principle of selection would be of great service for biblical instruction in the schools of our Church. It would, wherever the church-year is observed, bring the Sunday-school into direct sympathy with the whole Church service, and the instruction of the pastor from the pulpit might then serve as a stimulus and guide to those employed as teachers.

---

* Mabillon thus sums up the results of his inquiry: "Ex his omnibus conjicio, sex illas numericas notas pro totidem officiis, quæ in Lectionario nostro desiderari diximus, repetendas esse a festo Sancti Martini: quo ex tempore apud Gallos religio Adventus, id est præparatio ad Natale Domini initium ducebat." Lib. II. 101.

Of course, if our Sunday-schools are to be seminaries of exegesis, in which a critical survey of the various books of the Bible in their totality is to engage the mind, and this entirely separate from the service of the Church, and the concurrent instruction of the pastor from the pulpit, then such a principle of selection will be useless, and the selections will show themselves fragmentary and unsatisfactory. But if our Sunday-schools are to be the means of bringing the young into intelligent sympathy with the offices of the Church, enabling them to some extent to grasp the contents of the various services of the Church, and if their teaching is to be under the guidance of the life of the Church as this utters itself in its whole cultus, then no principle of selection can for a moment be compared with this, if combined, as it itself almost will necessitate, with the Confessional Creed of the Church.

Take for example the Advent and Christmas season just referred to. The hymns, as said, and indeed all the services of the Church are at once governed by the season. A common tone of thought and feeling enters the whole congregation, makes itself felt in the family and around the fireside, and becomes in the bosom of all a stirring impulse. The young and old alike come to recognize and feel it. Now would it not be strangely discordant in the midst of all this to coop up the children (pardon the harsh figure), and throw to them hard exegetical crusts from the record of the deluge, or the destruction of the cities of the plain, or the repentance of Jonah, or this or that, wherever the uniform series of lessons might happen to reach, in place of enkindling the thought and emotion and fancy even, which the sanctuary services have awakened, by calling them to ponder upon the rapt prophecies of Isaiah, until the hearts of the young come to glow with a kindred fire? There is in the old Church method a uniformity which carries along with it inward power, and strengthens the whole culture of the Church, which at present is felt by all to have so little significance. The selections in the Roman Breviary, for the season of Advent and for Christmas, are the following, which are exceedingly appropriate: First Advent Sunday, Isaiah i. 1–10; Second, Isaiah xi. 1–10; Third, Isaiah xxvi. 1–14; Fourth, Isaiah xxxv. and xli. 1–4.; Christmas, Isaiah, ix. 1–6, xl. 1–8, lii. 1–6.

Let us now turn to the Epiphany season, or as it is called in the Lib. Com., Theophania. It must be borne in mind that in the old Lectionaria the Gospel lessons for Epiphany included the adoration of the Magi, the baptism of the Saviour in Jordan, and the first miracle at Cana—a threefold manifestation of the divine glory lodged in the person of Christ. One of the collects for the day in the old Missale Gothicum thus beautifully refers to this: "O God, who hast in the wonderful signs of Thy power, exhibited the proofs of our salvation; who didst vouchsafe to the Magi, led by a glittering star, to adore and propitiate Thee, the eternal King and everlasting Lord, by mystic gifts; who by the mystery of a wonderful baptism in our flesh dost cleanse those who are regenerated by the renewing Spirit, and who, by changing water into wine by Thine ineffable power, didst manifest to Thy disciples Thy divinity; hear us Thy suppliants, at this most solemn season, and vouchsafe unto us, that, illumined by Thy glory, we may die unto the world and live unto Thee, O Christ, our King, and Saviour of the world, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit, livest and reignest forever." (Mabillon De. Lit. Gall. Lib. III. 208.) An old hymn, written in the early part of the fifth century by Sedulius, and which has found its way into the Roman Breviary for Epiphany, takes up the same themes: "The Magi started when they had seen the star, following as it led the way. They seek the Light by light, and confess God by their gifts. The celestial Lamb submitted to the washing of the pure stream. In cleansing us He bore the sin which He had not. He confirmed by miracles that he had God the Father, healing the sick and raising up the dead. Under the presence of a new kind of power, the water of the water-pots blushes, and, commanded to flow forth wine, changed its original nature." (Königsfeld, Lateinische Hymnen, 56.)

It is not at all difficult to grasp the general meaning of the Epiphany season, or to catch the significance of the order of the pericopes, as this moves forward to the Mount of Transfiguration, where the very body of Christ is translucent with the divine.

In the Lib. Com. the selection from the Old Testament for Epiphany, answering to the adoration of the Magi, is Isaiah lx. 1-6, and in the Lect. Gall. Isaiah lx. 1-16. The Sundays in Epiphany, however, are almost entirely destitute of selections from the Old Testament, only taking those passages in Isaiah which were supposed to refer directly to the Magi, or such as enclosed a warning in view of the conduct of Herod and the indifference of Jerusalem. At first view this may seem strange and without reason. But the manifestation of Christ to the *Gentiles* was a mystery hidden in the Old Testament, and seemingly reserved for a special revelation, and this chiefly through St. Paul (Galatians iii. 5–8); and hence the lessons throughout the season are taken from his epistles exclusively. In the consciousness of the Old Testament prophets, the coming in of the Gentiles seems to be in the way of bending in submission to the Jew. There was no full transcendence of the old covenant, reaching up to that higher reality of Christian freedom where, in the language of St. Paul, "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all and in all." As the Star led the wise men to Christ, a vast symbol of the truth that the Gentiles should be enlightened, so did St. Paul lead the Gentile world into the kingdom of His grace, the vast pledge of the reality of the same. Hence, no doubt, we find the Epistles of St. Paul exclusively read during this season.* Gavantus thus writes concerning this point: "Ab Epiphania (imo a natali Domini) ad septuagesimam leguntur Epistolæ S. Pauli; quia, inquit Ruper. lib. 10, cap. ult., dum repræsentur Christus in mundo, novi Testamenti præcones audiri debent ante Quadrigesimam" (Gavanti Thes., Sect. V., cap. xii., p. 84).

Let us now turn to the Paschal season. In the Lib. Com. for the vigil of Easter (de vigilia Paschæ), we have twelve selections from the Old Testament, as follows: (1) Genesis i. and ii. 2. (2) Genesis vi. to viii. 21. (3) Genesis xxii. 1–19. (4) Exodus xiv. 24–31. (5) Isaiah lv. 1–11. (6) Baruch iii. 9–38, cited, however, as from Jeremiah. (7) Ezekiel xxxvii. 1–14. (8) Isaiah iv. (9)

---

* That this thought was common to the Church is quite plain from the frequent and evidently designed use of St. Paul's peculiar language in the Epiphany hymns, as for example,

"Ambo sic populi, dissociabilis
Quos dudum paries separat, unicum
In corpus coeunt.
* * * * * *
Jam nativa oleæ brachia decidunt
Rami degeneres, germen adulterum,
Miratur novos semine non suo
Arbor crescere surculos."
—*Hymni Ecclesiæ; by I. H. Neale, p. 50.*

Exodus xii. 1–12. (10) Jonah iii., probably including the preceding chapter. (11) Deuteronomy xxxi. 22–30. (12) Daniel iii. 1–24.

The ten selections in the Lect. Gall. in Sabbato Sancto (two are lost by mutilation of the original manuscript) are almost entirely the same as in the Lib. Com. We find among these ten, however, two that are not in the Lib. Com.—Genesis xxvii. 1–40, and Joshua iii. and iv.

The four selections for the vigil of Pentecost in the Lib. Com. are the same as the selections for the vigil of Easter, commencing with the selection marked (2) above, and following on in order. In the Lect. Gall. there are no selections given for the vigil of Pentecost, probably because they have occurred in the vigil of Easter. For the Pentecost Sunday there is one selection—Joel ii. 21–32—drawn in from the fact of its quotation by St. Peter.

A somewhat detailed examination of these lessons just cited will serve to show very clearly the working of the principle to which I have referred as determining the selections found in the old lectionaria, viz., that there should be a harmony throughout the offices of the church, and that the Scripture selections are controlled by this.

The vigils of Easter and Pentecost very naturally drew to themselves the administration of the sacrament of baptism. Pentecost was itself the baptism of the Spirit, and the language of St. Paul, "buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead," is sufficient of itself to show why the early Church made the vigil of Easter one of the appointed times for blessing the font and administering baptism. Now bearing this in mind, we can easily see how appropriate and significant the selections are, and what elements of instruction they were supposed to contain.

The first selection contains the account of the creation, in which, out of darkness and chaos, by the moving of the Spirit upon the face of the waters, light and order are brought into existence. The early church saw here a vast symbol of the supernatural creation through water and the Spirit. Tertullian not only takes the whole as such a symbol, but finds in the details of the account additional types. Satisfied in his own mind that the mystery of the incoming of the supernatural world must illustrate and, indeed, underlie that of the natural, he uses these types with bold, polemic daring in his defence of baptism. The waters, he says, are first commanded to bring forth living things, as though to show that the new life is a birth from the water and the Spirit. ("Primis aquis praeceptum est animas proferre. Primus liquor quod viveret edidit ne mirum sit, in Baptismo, si aquæ animare noverunt." (De Baptismo, c. III.) So also S. Ambrose, S. Jerome, and indeed all the fathers of that early age. They hesitated not a moment to acknowledge that the natural water was a symbol and not a mere sign, and that no other material than this lies instrumentally at the root of the process of all life-generation, natural and supernatural. It is evident how, with such convictions, the rising of the first creation out of the womb of chaos and darkness, could most easily bring into view the rising of the second creation in Christ Jesus out of the darkness and chaos of the grave, giving to the Church a Sabbath in the Lord's day, comprehending the whole mystery of the Sabbath of the Old Testament, by completing, through the resurrection of Christ, all that it had symbolized. With such realistic views as these, it is easy to account for the selection as made for the vigil of Easter, when the font was blessed and the Paschal candle lighted, and baptism administered, and when indeed everything was set apart anew from the secular to the sacred by blessing. It constituted a *chord in the great harmony of the service.* It is this which we wish to emphasize, this principle guiding the selection, so that when read and studied the lesson may be supported and energized and implanted by the whole service of the Church. This is the uniformity which gives power to the services of the Church and makes them an ever-expanding, exhaustless source of edification. We do not mean here that we should adopt the services of the old Church, but that we should adopt the principle of having our *own service* a harmony in hymns and collects, and Scriptural readings and lessons, including the Sunday-school as well as the congregation and the pastor.

The second selection is an account of the deluge. This is joined most directly with the sacrament of baptism, and has very correctly been taken up into the baptismal collect. The writers of the early church seemed to take great delight in tracing the various types which they supposed were involved in this narrative. The dove sent from the ark, and returning with the olive branch, is a type of the Spirit bearing the peace of God. (*Eadem dispositione spiritatis effectus terræ, id est carni nostræ emergenti de lavacro post vetera delicta, columba sancti Spiritus advolat, pacem Dei afferens, emissa de coelis, ubi Ecclesia est arca figurata.*"—Tertullian de Baptismo, cap. viii.) S. Ambrose has written a tract, "*de Noe et Arca,*" where with wonderful ingenuity he has striven to exhaust the typical content of the narrative. It is needless to quote from the early fathers in reference to a point so plain to any one who has examined their writings. The deluge being thus in the mind of the early church a vast symbol of baptism, and at the same time of the resurrection, as an emergence out of death into life, it is quite plain that it very naturally became a theme for thought and meditation on the vigil of Easter, and constituted another chord in the harmony to which reference has been made.

The third selection is the account of the trial of Abraham in the sacrifice of his son Isaac, another vast symbol of the passion and resurrection of Christ in the mind of the early church. There seems to be a recognition of this, as including such symbolic reference, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. xi. 17–19, where the deliverance of Isaac from death was in way of symbol (ὲν παςαβολῇ), subsequently confirmed by the resurrection of the only begotten of God, who was given up as a sacrifice for the world. With Ambrose, Isaac is a type of Christ throughout. His name, signifying laughter, is typical of Christ, the fount of all spiritual joy; and this type was so universally recognized as to enter into the resurrection hymns of the mediæval church:

> "Puer, nostri forma risus,
> Pro quo vervex est occisus,
> Vitæ signat Gaudium."
> —*Adam de S. Victor.*

In his riding on an ass to the place of sacrifice, his bearing the wood upon his shoulders, and so on throughout the whole narrative, S. Ambrose sees type following on type of Christ's passion and resurrection. S. Augustine uses the narrative in the same manner. After giving a brief summary he says: "*Quaere quid sit: figura est Christi involuta sacramentis.*"—Enarratio in Psalmum xxx. 9." This is sufficient to show why this selection occupies the place it does in the old Lectionaria.

The fourth selection is the narrative of the passage through the Red Sea. St. Paul calls this a baptism unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, 1 Corinthians, chap. x. 1–2, and hence very justly it has entered into the baptismal collect. S. Augustine, in his sermon on this narrative and the accompanying canticle, says no one of the faithful, after what St. Paul hath written, can doubt that the passage of the Red Sea is a figure of baptism. As we are freed from the devil and his angels, who, as Pharaoh and the Ægyptians, have harassed us, bound to the mire of flesh as to the works in brick—freed through baptism, Christ being our leader, whom Moses set forth in figure, let us sing to the Lord, for he hath done gloriously. Sermo ccclxiii. 2.* We venture to state that it is impossible to find any comment on this narrative by the early fathers of the church, which does not view it in such typical form as including baptism, in which, as they thought, there was a real rising out of bondage and death into life.

---

* This sentiment of Augustine has found beautiful expression in one of the old Paschal hymns :

"Forti tegente brachio
Evasimus rubrum mare
Tandemque durum perfidi
Jugum tyranni fregimus.

Nunc ergo laetas vindici
Grates rependamus Dio."

—*Hymni Eccl., by I. H. Neale.*

[*To be continued.*]

ART. IV.—SOME OF THE PERILS OF THE MINISTRY.

BY REV. SPANGLER KIEFFER, HAGERSTOWN, MD.

PERHAPS no other profession has been so frequently criticised, satirized and caricatured, as that of the Christian ministry. The slightest survey of the world of ficitious literature, for instance, will show how largely those who have made their reputations here are indebted to this never-failing theme. The reason of this it is easy to perceive. The office of the Christian ministry involves higher and more sacred interests than any other; and just in consequence of this, that discrepancy between the ideal and the actual, in which the possibility of satire has its root, is apt to come more broadly out in the clerical profession than in any other phase of life. This makes the calling of a minister of the gospel a shining and easy mark to shoot at. It affords abundant room for wit and raillery, for the drawing of grotesque pictures and the saying of smart things generally. The clerical character occupies a conspicuous place in the satirical novel, and is familiar to all. The unworldliness of his calling and the intense earthliness of his character, form a contrast altogether peculiar and of the finest "effect." The love of the world is, according to the idea of his office, extinct within his reverend breast, but, in reality, no one has a keener appetite for the good things of earth than he. He preaches moving sermons and loves good dinners. He is fond of flattery, ease, and worldly gain. A weak, self-indulgent and affected creature, now amusing and now contemptible, he simpers, whines, rants, and acts the hypocrite all the story through, and is held up by the story writer to the ridicule and contempt of all honest people.

In all this there is nothing to be vexed at. For it must be conceded that such representations are, to a great extent, grounded in reality and truth, as well as that, on the other hand, pictures of genuine pastoral faithfulness are not wanting in the same department of literature. So far as the criticism and satire in the case may be exaggerated and unjust, it is proper for those to whom the honor of the Christian ministry is dear, to apply the maxim, *Fas est et ab hoste doceri;* and it may serve as a wholesome discipline of humility for them to sit at the feet of unfriendly reviewers, and learn of them. It is from their enemies that men are most likely to gain the necessary knowledge of their weakness and faults. Hence the most hostile criticism may do a friendly service; the most biting satire has a healthy and healing element in it; and even the most exaggerated caricature may serve the useful purpose of exposing an unsuspected weak point.

Meanwhile, it may be well, in a different spirit and for a different purpose, to consider some of the dangers to which the calling of the Christian minister is peculiarly exposed. To say that the Christian ministry has dangers peculiar to itself, is only to say what is equally true of every other profession. It is necessary, however, to say more; namely, that its perils are probably greater than those belonging to any other vocation. This results from its relative greatness and importance, as the highest of all offices that may be borne by men. The greater the office the greater the peril. The mightier the advantage intended, the more sweeping the disadvantage and detriment which may possibly follow. Every great blessing carries wrapped up in itself the possibility of a great curse; and the greatness of the curse is measured by the magnitude of the blessing. Following this law, the Christian ministry, an office "of divine origin and truly supernatural character and force;" the highest with which a mortal may be invested; involving higher and more sacred interests, and greater possibilities of good than any other vocation, is exposed, on this very account, to evil possibilities and perils proportionably great.

To bear the office of the ministry is, under any circumstances, a hazardous position to be in; but this is especially the case where there is no suitable reflection upon the dangers attending it. It may not be without profit, therefore, to point out a few of these, as it is the object of this paper, without attempting any full discussion of the subject, to do.

We mention first a certain danger which may not be so general as some others, but is nevertheless worthy of notice. It is one which grows out of the external circumstances in which, for the most part, the life of the minister is passed. For it is hardly necessary to say that we are speaking here, not of the ministry as it may be seen in large cities or under any conditions exceptionally favorable, but of the average ministry throughout the land. How to characterize this peculiar form of danger we scarcely know, unless we should call it that of

PETTINESS OR MEANNESS.

We mean that there is something in the outward circumstances of a minister's life which tends to dwarf that largeness, manliness and independence of spirit, which must enter as a principal ingredient into all true human usefulness. Partly, perhaps, because it differs so greatly from other professions, as not being of the same secular character, or based on the same business foundations; and partly in consequence of the denominational divisions of the Church in this country, resulting in the fact that four or five weak congregations often struggle for an existence where one would answer all the need, the ministry, for the most part, does not meet with sufficient temporal support. The disproportion between labor and recompense is greater in the ministry than in any other of the learned professions. We do not say that this should not be so; we think that injury has often been done by advocating the better support of the ministry with arguments based exclusively on the *quid pro quo* principle which prevails in the world of business. We are simply stating the fact that the slenderness of the average minister's income is so common as to be proverbial. It is but telling the truth to say that many a minister is compelled to waste much time and energy in "mean cares and dirty economies;" and it is easy to see, in the case of one bearing an office which calls for the largest and freest development of his personality, how hindering, crippling and dwarfing such occupations must often be. In addition to this, the minister, in such circumstances, incurs the danger of degrading himself by "crying out" under the pinching process, and clamoring, in one way or another, for compassion. The talk about "us poor preachers" is not infrequent, and is painfully suggestive of a deteriorated manhood.

The peril is, for many, only increased by the means with which it is often sought to ameliorate their condition. A kind and thoughtful people come to the help of their pastor, and seek by gifts, donations, and the concession of various advantages in the transactions of life, to relieve the narrowness of his affairs. The intention is a kind and touching one; and it is possible, of course, for a Christian minister to stand in this relation to the community, without necessarily sacrificing any element of manhood. But it is plain that, for the most part, it is not a healthy relation to be in; and a thousand cases show that it has a tendency to blunt some of the finest elements of manly character. This danger begins whenever a minister "accepts the situation," not as a trying one, which circumstances may temporarily necessitate or justify, but as being in itself normal and right. Then the way is open for a descending course of increasing narrowness of spirit. He may become not only willing, but greedy, in respect of receiving gifts. He may learn to accept them without that delicacy and sensitiveness which is one of the indications, as it is one of the safeguards of an uninjured nature.

It is a painful picture, which we prefer should be drawn by another pen, the pen of one who has proved himself, in the main, a just and generous critic of the ministry.* "They are men," says this writer, "whose hands are always open to receive whatever comes; who delight in donation parties, and who grasp right and left with insatiable greed at gifts. They become so mean-spirited that they do not like to pay for anything, and do not really think it right that they should be called on to pay for anything. They are sponges upon their people and the community. Wherever they happen to be, they "lie down" on the brethren. There is nothing of value that they are not glad to receive, and there is nobody that they are not glad to be indebted to for favors. Sometimes they are extravagant, and have a graceless way of getting into debt, out of which they are helped yearly, and out of which they expect to be helped yearly. The abject meanness into which a pastor can sink, and the corresponding and consequent powerlessness into which he can fall, find too frequent illustration among the American ministry. It is shocking and sickening that there are some men who seem forced by their parishes to live in this way, and it is still more disgusting to find men who seem tolerably comfortable and contented while living in this way." The same author has, under the character of the Rev. Peter Mullens, in "Arthur Bonnicastle," given us an example of what a minister is capable of becoming in this direction. It would be far from his intention, we presume, to offer the above as a description of a state of affairs at all general, but it is sufficient to show that the outward circumstances of most ministers' lives afford the opportunity, and involve the peril, of falling into extraordinary abjectness of spirit.

---

*Dr. J. G. Holland, in "Scribner's Monthly," Vol. II., No. 3.

Let us not be unjustly severe. The ordinary minister's life has in it, considered as to its worldly condition, not a little of the sad and painful. It is, in many cases, a life of chafing narrowness, hemmed in on every side by pinching and crippling influences. "*Haud facile emergunt quorum virtutibus obstat res angusta domi.*" These words of Juvenal find a forcible illustration of their truth in ministerial life. How full of meaning do they seem now to many a minister who read them carelessly at college. He reads them over now, and, as they are illuminated by his own experience, he wonders at the singular expressiveness of every word and phrase. "*Res angusta domi*"—how well he knows that angular visage! And could anything be so both sadly and amusingly expressive as that "*emergunt?*" That is precisely what his life (upon its earthly side) has apparently been a vain endeavor to do; to "emerge" into a world of freedom from petty cares. Every door of egress is barred against him, to which is added this chafing mortification, that, while the narrowness of his means is continually preventing, the rank and dignity of his office are continually supposing, a corresponding emergence on his part, into that breadth of reading and travel and general culture which is scarcely possible except to those in easy circumstances. It is, upon one side, a life of disappointment, vexation and indignity. Whilst, therefore, we condemn the meanness in question, let us not make light of the provocation; nor forget that if some ministers fall a prey to this abjectness of spirit, it may be only after years of the wearing, wasting and weakening influences of such a life.

No outward narrowness of circumstances, however, can justify inward narrowness of spirit, nor any sacrifice of temporal comfort, the sacrifice of a man's sacred manhood. So far as the danger in question may incidentally belong to the office of the ministry, this office can be safely borne only by being constantly and resolutely on one's guard. And it will go far in fortifying a minister against this danger, to remember that self-denial belongs peculiarly and essentially to the office he bears; that it is one of the sacred burdens which his ordination imposed upon him; that it is in itself a wholesome thing and a great safeguard, that the ministry should not be too much at ease in this world. Further, it will be a comfort and help to realize that, while a minister's circumstances expose him, in some degree, to the danger of selfishness and meanness, they at the same time afford the opposite and compensating opportunity for the building up of a character exceptionally unselfish, large and noble. There is the opportunity of heroism here. Is there no heroism in wearing the traditional threadbare coat with a cheerful face and a loving heart; in doing work which is *not* paid for by any equivalent "wages;" in seeking to make one's life most like His who came "not to be ministered unto, but to minister?"

Another peril which the office of the ministry seems to involve is that of

FALSEHOOD.

We take the word in its broad and fundamental sense, as standing for the want of correspondence between the inward reality and the outward expression or form. Taken in this general sense, falsehood is something to which the nature and relations of the ministry make it peculiarly liable. For the truths of which a minister is the exponent are so high and sacred, the realities with which he has to do are of such transcendent character, that, in his case, there is far more than ordinary difficulty in preserving a perfectly truthful attitude and utterance.

We do not now refer to that state of falsehood which must exist wherever there is no true faith and piety upon the minister's part. When a minister's heart is not in his work, when his preaching and praying and his entire attitude as a minister of the Gospel are but empty forms, his life, of course, is one of conscious hypocrisy—a falsehood so hideous and glaring as to need no pointing out. The falsehood of which we speak is not so easily discerned and guarded against as this. It comes in subtler and more insidious form. The danger of it may exist even where there is a reasonable degree of faith, piety and earnestness in Christian work. There may be no conscious acting of a part; but, through the indirect and powerful influence of attitude, custom, routine, an influence of which we are for the most part unaware, there may be an unconscious falling short in the correspondence between the inward and the outward, the outward sign standing by itself, without being, as it claims to be, the true expression of an inward, answering reality.

Perhaps ministers of the Gospel, more than any other class of honest and honorable men, are in danger of this unconscious, yet seriously hurtful, falsification. Not only are the truths and realities of the Christian religion, which in some sense seek their utterance through the personality of the minister of the Gospel, of such exalted and sacred nature as to render a discrepancy of this kind at once more likely and more dangerous, but the necessities of his situation are such as greatly to increase the peril. He bears an office to the exercise of which tradition has affixed a certain well-defined character. Not only must he preach and perform various religious acts at stated times; but, perhaps without his being conscious of it, the hand of custom is strong upon him to compel him to do this according to certain accepted ideas and prevalent expectations. There is that in his position and its surroundings which powerfully tends to make him utter himself in a manner which presupposes the existence of certain internal states of feeling, whether these do actually exist or not. He has his routine, which is more dangerous here than elsewhere. The likelihood of its becoming in part *mere* routine is vastly increased. For these reasons the minister's position seems to be one in which it is specially difficult to maintain that perfect truthfulness of word, act and general bearing which no man may depart from without suffering moral detriment. This is what we mean by the peril of falsehood as belonging to the ministry.

Probably no earnest minister of the Gospel has reflected upon the solemnity and responsibility of his office without being more or less aware of this peculiar danger, and of the necessity of guarding against it. It may indeed be exaggerated. We suppose, for example, that a sense of this danger may have had something to do with the act by which certain bodies of religious people have entirely rejected the office of the ministry, and have left no room for any public religious utterance except as men might be "moved by the Spirit." This, however, is an exaggeration of the peril, and no remedy of the case whatever. Our Saviour having instituted an office of the highest importance, which proves to be attended (as was to be expected) with perils correspondingly great, to give up the office, though the shortest disposition of the question, is the poorest solution of the difficulty. The truth is, however great the danger may be, it is none but such as a simple and unaffected piety is able to overcome. True Christian faith and humility, in a state of constant revival; a deep sense of the awfulness of the realities with which he has to do; prayer for divine help; resolute naturalness in all his religious utterances; a watchfulness ever suspicious of danger, and on the alert against the mysterious benumbing influence of custom and routine—these are the minister's sufficient safeguards here. Without these, indeed, it is impossible to escape from falsehood in the ministry; but with these there is no reason why a minister's life should be one of even unconscious falsification.

There is, however, one particular safeguard in this respect, of which every thoughtful minister's experience will teach him the advantage and necessity. This will best be brought to view by reference to a certain species of preaching which stands in special danger in this direction, chiefly because of its one-sided and morbid character. There is a kind of preaching, namely, by no means infrequent, which seems to rest on the assumption that the leading characteristic of the Gospel is that of its appeal to the emotional nature. The preacher's manner is habitually at a high pitch, both in respect of the feelings which it supposes to be laboring in his own breast, and in respect of the emotions which he evidently seeks to awaken in the breasts of his hearers. To preach in this style is to be treading on very dangerous ground. No one can make a habit of it and be safe. Woe to the minister who, in his pulpit ministrations, becomes a huckster of emotions. Nothing but a miracle can save that man from occasional, if not habitual (even though, through force of custom, it be unconscious) falsehood.

Perhaps the reader has witnessed the sudden and astounding change which one short hour has been able to work in a preacher of this class. He has seen him in the midst of social gayety and frolic; bearing his part at the festive board; participating in jokes, bantering and innocent folly; enjoying the privilege of making himself thoroughly at home on earth ; a privilege which no reasonable man would deny him. But, an hour afterwards, he has seen the same person in the midst of a sermon or prayer so highly-wrought in manner as to imply a degree of spiritual ecstasy which his hearer's experience would lead him to believe a mortal being might but seldom attain to. And the reflecting reader has perhaps said to himself: "If these extravagant feelings are genuine, then, certainly, here is a remarkable phenomenon ; and the marvel in the case is, that any one could be so transported, by a leap, as it were, from the earth to the stars. If, however, the inward emotion does not correspond to the outward expression, is not this the very essence of falsehood ?"

The danger, in this case, grows out of a misconception as to the nature of religion and the preaching of the Gospel. Christianity has to do with feeling indeed ; but feeling is by no means a leading characteristic of it, nor does the preaching of the Gospel chiefly aim to produce certain emotions in the hearts of men. Feelings come and go ; they depend on circumstances, and are not under our control. To require of us to have certain feelings at certain times would be a most unjust and tyrannical law. To demand of us the expression of certain feelings, at certain times, would be to expose us, as the God of truth could not be supposed to do, to the peril of falsehood, without reason and without the possibility of escape. Whilst, however, we cannot always have or express lively religious emotions, and whilst a habit of implying a uniform existence of these, or their regular recurrence at stated times, is a dangerous one, there is one thing which every Christian man may at all times possess, and the existence of which may be safely taken for granted wherever there is a sound Christian character. It is faith, which lies far deeper than feeling ; it is the steadfast setting of the will, as the central power of our being, towards God ; it is that profounder love of God which continues to go out towards Him, even when the feelings hang back ; it is the spirit of obedience, the concern for duty, which may exist unimpaired even when the state of the feelings may be depressed and cheerless. The Gospel appeals to the faith of men, and not their feelings ; has less to do with lofty transports than with lowly duty ; and calls not so much for their emotions as for their obedience. Where there is faith and obedience, feelings of comfort and joy will come at such time and in such degree as God sees best for each one. The latter are incidental to the Christian life; the former are of its essence, and may alone be safely implied as always present to Christian experience.

It follows from this that, as it accords most thoroughly with the nature of the Gospel, so also it is one of the greatest safeguards in the preaching of it that there should be caution and restraint in respect of the expression or implication of any extraordinary degree of religious feeling. The minister of the Gospel is not only doing his most valuable work, but he is at the same time most securely guarding himself against a certain kind of falsehood when, instead of sailing amid the stars, he is laboring on the solid ground; when he seeks to instruct rather than excite, and has more to do with the world of lowly duty than with the realm of spiritual transports. Not only is there needed a strict conscientious care lest the degree of feeling indicated by tone or manner be above that which is felt within; but it is the part of wisdom to exercise a certain restraint in the expression of what feelings may be actually experienced. The principle of reserve, moderation, understatement, as a source of power, is a well-known one. In oratory and art some of the finest results are achieved by the practice of it. It was the practice of Daniel Webster, for example, upon this principle, "rather to understate than to overstate the strength of his confidence in the soundness of his own arguments;" and it is commonly known that the suppression of feeling is often more powerfully affecting than the unrestrained giving vent to it. What we would direct attention to here, however, is, that this reserve or understatement, in addition to being a source of increased strength, is a source of increased protection and safety. It is a matter of morals, no less than of policy, to make use of it. To the minister of the gospel, in particular, it affords such protection against the peril of falsehood, as, if thoughtful and prudent, he will gladly take advantage of; only the more gladly because in doing so he will be in the way of carrying out most successfully his divinely appointed work.

This leads us to consider a broader peril of the same nature; the peril, as we may call it, of

GENERAL SPIRITUAL DETERIORATION.

It may appear presuming to attribute to the holy ministry perils so great and so directly contrary to its own idea. But it must be remembered that, just because it is no ordinary office, its dangers are of no common character.

It is quite easy, we think, to show that a minister's position, so far from necessarily tending, as it might seem, to promote in a special degree his spiritual growth, carries in itself a certain danger, which, if not guarded against, will act as a special hindrance to that growth. This assertion is based upon a well-known principle, thus expressed by Bishop Butler: "Going over the theory of virtue in one's thoughts; talking well and drawing fine pictures of it; this is so far from necessarily or certainly conducing to form a habit of it in him who thus employs himself, that it may harden the mind in a contrary course, and render it gradually more insensible; that is, form a habit of insensibility to all moral considerations."* This principle calls for no defending argument here. It is universally accepted by writers on morals, and is confirmed by all experience.

Now there necessarily belongs to the office of the ministry, particularly to the work of preaching, much that may be said to fall under the general head of "going over the theory of virtue." The minister has much to say upon religious subjects. His calling leads him to speak largely in praise of virtue; to dwell upon the beauty and happiness of the Christian life; to draw frequent representations of the Christian graces. This is where the peril lies. To be thus employed would seem, to superficial reflection, to be in circumstances especially favorable to the growth of virtue and holiness; but, in reality, the position is one which carries in itself a certain subtle danger of the contrary result, namely, of religious demoralization and decline.

For it is dangerous to have much to *say* about religion. Not that the utterance of religious sentiment is in itself dangerous; but, in proportion as one has much of this to do, and as greater attention and energy are consumed in this employment, the probability is increased of a falling short on the side of practice, and of a consequent hardening, according to the above principle, of the moral and religious susceptibilities. The danger is not simply that of becoming, in one's life, a standing contradiction to one's profession. It is the danger of actual retrogression and loss. Our Saviour's solemn word is here fulfilled: "From him that hath not shall be taken away, even that which he hath." "Edifying conversation" is not merely useless, but positively injurious, when it is not supported by an edifying life. The preaching of a minister whose life is not at least a thoroughly honest attempt to practice his own precepts, becomes a source of spiritual detriment to him. The minister who does not practice what he preaches, is not precisely like the stationary sign-post to which he is often compared. He is rather like one who, while pointing others one way, is himself being carried gradually and forcibly in the opposite direction.

---

*Butler's Analogy, I., v., 5.

The loss in the case consists in the blunting of susceptibilities of the most vital importance; susceptibilities which the secret faithful practice of Christian duties preserves in a fresh and healthy state, but which much religious theorizing, without equivalent practice, tends to destroy. There is a bloom of reverence and religious susceptibility which, like the bloom of the peach, is liable to be destroyed by frequent handling. It is more apt to be found unimpaired in the sheltered life of the faithful private Christian than in his whose calling exposes him to a dangerous publicity. Many a minister has reason to long for the fewer risks and superior spiritual advantages of some of those to whom he ministers; persons who are not called upon to say much on the subject of religion; who reverently and humbly read God's word; who faithfully use the means of grace, and whose energies are chiefly expended in the performance of practical Christian duties. For, in such cases, there is greater protection; and the lives of such persons are often characterized, in an extraordinary degree, by delicate spiritual sensitiveness, tender conscientiousness, and high and strict sense of duty—qualities of the most fundamental account, but which the thoughtful minister cannot but feel himself exposed, in a certain degree, to the danger of losing. The mysterious influence of certain peculiarities of his calling continually tends to obtund them, and thus to produce a secret spiritual declension.

That there is real and great danger here, we think the majority of ministers would, upon reflection, bear witness; and, we suppose, an analysis of the religious and moral condition of the average ministry would often bring to view traces of special spiritual deterioration. The danger, however, lies in a quarter where its presence is so little suspected, that it is not surprising that there should be but slight appreciation of it. It seems natural to take it for granted that of all Christian men, a minister enjoys the highest advantages for growth in holiness. It seems, at first, absurd to say that, among Christian men, he stands in peculiar and unusual danger of spiritual declension. Hence there seems to be but little sense of this peril. It is significant, for example, that it seems to be an accepted arrangement for a minister, after devoting eleven months to the care of others' souls, to spend the twelfth, as a vacation, in recuperating his physical energies, at such place and in such recreations as his circumstances may allow. What he is supposed to need, is special care for his physical health, for which purpose the springs, or the seashore, or the mountains are resorted to. A wise and useful regulation ; for the proverb which denounces "all work and no play," applies to ministers as well as to boys. But it is significant that no such time seems ever to be set apart that he may devote special care to his spiritual health, and look narrowly after the condition of his own soul. That, it is taken for granted (very erroneously, if the above view is correct) is perfectly well provided for by his general calling as a minister. Perhaps there is more truth in the Roman Catholic custom, which, recognizing the fact that a priest, in caring for the souls of others, may be neglecting his own, provides the "retreat," with its retirement, self-examination, prayer and spiritual discipline, for the purpose of guarding against this danger. It is at least a question, whether it would not be wholesome for Protestant ministers to devote to the soul a portion of that often liberal allowance of time which is devoted to the body.

Against the peril whose nature and source we have tried to indicate, there is no safety except in the thorough correspondence, at least so far as will and intent can go, between one's utterances and his acts ; a correspondence which is indeed equally required of every Christian man, but which is particularly difficult to maintain in the case of the minister. Preaching must be guarded against being a theorizing about religion, or a "drawing fine pictures" of virtue. One's obedience must be kept up to the point of one's preaching, if the soul is not to suffer. What we have said of the usefulness of reserve and understatement, as a means of safety, will not be without its application here. The tone of preaching, while satisfying the lofty requirements of the Gospel, must not be pitched so needlessly high that the life will by compulsion fall short of it. To be safe, preaching needs to be more lowly than it often is; not less earnest, but more lowly. Best and safest of all is preaching, when little or no room is left to distinguish it, as "theory" from "practice," as something different; when it is itself practice; when it becomes itself an act of obedience and virtue; when it consists not in the discussion of abstract truths, but in the heralding forth of the great redemptive facts of the Gospel, and in the intensely practical endeavor to bring men, upon the basis of these, to repentance and faith in Christ.

Those perils of the ministry which we have been discussing, are such as directly tend to affect the minister's moral and religious character; while, through this medium, they also, of course, ultimately affect his work. There are others which, perhaps without affecting personal character in the same way, have a direct tendency to injure his efficiency and endanger the success of his ministry. Of these we shall mention two. The first is that of

ISOLATION.

We mean isolation from the people, as carrying with it a falling short in that knowledge of human life and broad sympathy with men, which ministers, more than any other class of persons, would seem to need.

It is certain that a correct knowledge of men and a deep love of the people are indispensable requisites for a minister's success. He needs to be one with his fellow-men through the warm "sympathy of humanity." He needs to know men, their modes of life, their ways of thinking and feeling, their dangers, their troubles, their temptations, their sins. To this end he needs to stand in constant, living and responsive intercourse with them. Our Saviour's free mingling with men and His yearning love of the people were among the shining characteristics of His ministry. He went into the world; He saw its varied phases; He sat in the homes of the rich and the poor; He loved all kinds of people; He identified Himself, so to speak, with men.

Now, however, there is something in the very office of a minister which tends to produce a fatal isolation from the people. If, as is frequently charged, there exists among the ministry a deficiency in the true knowledge of human life and a narrowness of sympathy with men; if the broad "sympathy of humanity," as is sometimes (whether justly or unjustly) claimed, is apt to be found in a larger measure among non-clerical or even non-Christian persons, than among clergymen; the secret reason of this state of affairs, so far as it may actually exist, lies chiefly in the fact that ministers, as a class, are exposed to special dangers in this respect.

In the first place, the ministry shares in the danger which always threatens to isolate an educated class from the mass of the people. This danger is not greater for the ministry than for any other learned profession, except in so far as that the results of such an isolation are perhaps in no other case so disastrous as for it.

In the second place, however, there is that peculiarity in the minister's office, or, more properly speaking, in the popular conception of it, which tends to produce isolation by repulsion on the part of the people. The ministerial office, as having much to do with the unseen spiritual world, often finds itself met by the people with a degree of constraint and a certain kind of fear, as if something unearthly and spectral went along with it. It encounters very much of the caricature of that reverence which legitimately belongs to it. This is found to be the case, even where it has been sought to remove the last vestige of "superstition" respecting the ministry, by reducing the conception of it to that of the office of a simple "teacher." The results are painful. The minister seeks an intimate knowledge of people; he finds that his office makes them, to some extent, reserved and repelling. Whatsoever knowledge of the interior life of people a minister gains, he must, for the most part, as it were, conquer for himself. He will fare better in proportion as he is more aggressive in spirit; but, if he be at all disposed to acceptance of, and acquiescence in, what position he may be thrust into, he will almost inevitably find himself drifting towards a compulsory ignorance of, and isolation from, the people.

What we have said of repulsion on the part of the people, is especially true of that knowledge which the minister, as the physician of the soul, needs most of all to gain; that is, the knowledge of men's sins. As the physician must not only know the general fact that a man is sick, but also what particular form of disease he labors under; so, also, it would seem necessary for the minister, in order to labor to advantage, not merely to know that men are sinners, but what particular sins they have to struggle with. Here, however, he finds himself baffled on every side. At this point men lock up their hearts, build bulwarks around themselves, warn the approaching minister against trespass on these forbidden grounds, and go on sinning while he walks around among them in the dark.

The results of isolation, whether forced or voluntary, are for a minister extremely pernicious. It imparts a peculiar character of unreality and ghostliness to his intercourse with men. It makes his whole life a missing of the mark. Such a minister moves in a world of shadows; he preaches to "phantom congregations," instead of the real men and women before him; he does not know the trials, sorrows and sins of his people; he makes fatal mistakes in ministering to diseased souls; he fails to be that source of light and help and comfort which God meant him to be in a world of sin and trouble.

There seems to be at the present time a very lively sense of the evils of isolation in the ministry. Much has been earnestly said and written on the subject. Very forcibly it has been urged that one of the great needs of the ministry is to "get nearer the people;" that a minister cannot help men without knowing them; that, to be a true minister, he must have a heart full of warm and throbbing sympathy for all kinds of people; that to be without a true knowledge of men and their affairs, in the world of home, in the world of business, in the world of poverty, suffering and sin, is to be radically embarrassed and crippled in his usefulness. All of which is most true and to be profoundly laid to heart. Perhaps, in what has been said, sufficient account has not always been made of the peculiar danger to which the minister is exposed, of being dragged or driven into a certain isolation; perhaps it has been too much taken for granted that, where such a relation exists, it is wholly the result of choice and not at all of compulsion; but this does not affect the truth of the judgment pronounced.

Respecting safeguards against this danger, we are not prepared to speak with any great degree of assurance. We are pointing out the perils of the ministry, without promising or feeling able, in each case, to indicate sufficient remedies. In this particular instance, especially, it is much easier to see the danger and the evil, than to find the necessary correctives and safeguards. We are of the opinion that the evil is much more deeply seated than is commonly supposed. It does not rest wholly, as many seem to imagine, with the will of the minister, so that the whole case may be settled by a simple act of volition on his part. It is largely the result of powers beyond himself, with which he has to struggle, and which he must conquer, in order to win for himself a necessary oneness with the people. It is in good part the product of external circumstance, of existing system, of traditional and established relations, the force of which underlying and far-reaching influences it does not rest with the minister successfully to break through just at his own will. It is flippancy, in dealing with so serious a difficulty, to suppose, as many criticisms and exhortations seem to do, that the generality of ministers are willing to be isolated from the people; that they idly see one of the mightiest instruments of usefulness slipping from their grasp; and that all the case requires is, that they should bestir themselves, and go forth and become acquainted with the people, who are supposed to be anxiously waiting to unlock to them the secret knowledge of their interior life. Would that the solution of the question might depend solely upon the minister's choice! Then the world would not see, as it now sees, thousands of earnest ministers seeking, in heart and will and act, to know and to be one with the people, but always baffled more or less in the accomplishment of their desire.

What means one particular branch of the church employs to gain for its ministers a knowledge of men, and especially of their sins, is well known. It is the confessional. Whatever may be said of it, no one will dispute its power. The fact that it is confessedly the secret source of that powerful grasp which the Roman Catholic Church holds on a large portion of mankind, and that penetrating influence which it has been able to exert upon the lives of its adherents, testifies at least to the fact we have been discussing, of the necessity for a spiritual guide to know the internal life of men. Protestantism rejects the confessional. It essays a higher task, the task of dealing with men upon the principle of evangelical freedom.

To it belongs the destiny and the power of achieving a higher and nobler success than Roman Catholicism. But every possibility of a higher success, involves the possibility of a deeper and more damaging failure. This superior character and destiny of Protestantism could not be purchased without a price; and a part of the price seems to be the increased danger to which its ministers are exposed, of falling into a painful and disabling ignorance of the hearts and lives of the people.

Not that such ignorance and isolation are in any case necessitated. A sufficient knowledge of the people, we are bound to believe, is possible, as it is necessary for every Christian minister, and, when gained by Protestant methods, is doubtless of far greater ethical value than when gained through compulsory confession. In order to guard himself against the great danger of isolation, let a minister mingle freely with men, and seek a thorough knowledge of human life, under its manifold aspects. Let him be constantly on his guard against the tendency of his office to isolate him from his fellow-men. Above all, let him keep alive in his heart a broad catholic sympathy and love for all kinds of people. Love will unlock more doors, reveal more secrets, conquer more obstacles, and make a minister more truly one with the people than all other powers combined. To this we would add, as a perfectly legitimate means of a minister's knowing the people, the encouragement of confession in a voluntary, as distinguished from compulsory, form. There are few earnest ministers, we suppose, who have not felt the disadvantage of laboring where there is absolutely nothing to meet this want.

The very discussion of this peril naturally leads us to look out for one on the other side. Dangers generally come, not singly, but in pairs. As a virtue is commonly the mean between two vices, so the true path of safety lies mostly between two opposite dangers. Alas! that we are so apt to perceive only one; that, whilst we seek to avoid Scylla on the one hand, we often forget the equally fatal Charybdis on the other.

We mention, therefore, finally, a peril of the ministry exactly opposite to the last named one, the peril, namely, of what we may call

IDENTIFICATION

with the life of the world. By this we mean a becoming one with the world of human life, not such as we have seen to be necessary in order to deliver and help it, but such as amounts to a becoming part and parcel of it. There it was a going down to lift men up, here it is going down to stay there with them.

This danger is equally real with the last mentioned. If there is, in a minister's relation to the world, much to isolate him from it, there is also, under another aspect of the case, as we shall see, much which tends to tempt or drag him down to its level. It is equally fatal in its results. If that minister is incapacitated for his work, who is secluded and isolated from men, without a true, practical knowledge of them, he is equally disabled who does not, in a certain important sense, stand aloof from men. There is no contradiction here. Isolation is one thing; what we choose to call detachment is another. Isolated the minister must not be; detached he must always be. Such detachment is thoroughly consistent with the utmost familiarity with men, and in it his true strength lies. Moreover, this danger is one of which no sufficient account seems to be made at the present time. So greatly is the danger of isolation dreaded, that the opposite peril does not seem to excite any suitable degree of apprehension.

There is something in the experience of the ministry, as related to the world, precisely analogous to a striking fact in the ministry of Christ. No one can read the gospels without being aware that the world in which He moved was to our Saviour as a powerful maelstrom greedy to draw Him into its current. The prevalent perverted Messianic expectations of the people called upon Him, on every hand, to turn aside from His high mission of suffering and death, and fall in with them. It is easy to see how this fact constituted the dark background of the temptation in the wilderness; how the satanic effort to make Him yield to the expectations of the people was continually repeated during our Saviour's life; and how His victory over temptation consisted in good part of His victory over this peril of identifying Himself with the world which He came to save. Now, there is something exactly parallel to this in the experience of the ministry. The world has still its false views as to its own needs and the mode of its redemption; its pervreted expectation as to what the Gospel and its minister ought to be. It meets the minister with these and woos him with siren voice to adopt and fall in with them. The temptation comes to him, as it came to his Master, under the insidious form of a promise of greater usefulness, power and success. The world says to him : " We are carrying on a great work here ; we are civilizing the world ; we are emancipating the race ; we are hastening the 'golden age.' You are one of the natural leaders in this march of progress. Fall in with us and lead us on to glorious victory." It is the old voice of the Tempter ; it is the old battle of the wilderness which every minister of Christ, following his Master, must fight over again ; the battle in which "Get thee behind me, Satan !" is the watchword, and renunciation and detachment the victory.

The ministry has many points of exposure to this temptation and danger. For example, the minister's office necessitates public speaking. It is altogether an incidental and subordinate necessity. There is no evidence that the Lord intended to rely greatly upon oratory for the success of the Gospel. It does not accord with God's mode of dealing to accomplish the greatest results by those means which men consider great and admirable ; but rather to confound human wisdom by using chiefly those instruments which to men would seem poor, weak and vile. There is no evidence that any of the Apostles were fine public speakers in the accepted sense of the term. Even Paul, in whom, above all, powerful eloquence might have been looked for, was " in speech contemptible." But fine public speaking has always had in it something striking and captivating to the popular mind. Men are used to it in courts, lecture-halls and political assembles ; they demand it of the pulpit. A powerful pressure bears indirectly upon the minister, to compel him to yield to this popular clamor for fine speaking in the pulpit, as that without which no minister can hope to be " successful." One of his strongest temptations, in these times, is that of becoming an " orator ;" a temptation the more dangerous, because to " draw crowded houses" and bring the multitude under the sound of his preaching, seems to be a self-evident increase of his usefulness and power. Alas, where the demand is complied with, where fine public speaking becomes, as it is in a thousand instances, the ruling characteristic of the ministry, what is this, for the most part, but the minister's cowardly and crippling surrender to a false and deceiving world; what is it but one form of a disabling identification with the world which his office calls him to help in saving?

Again, the ministry has necessarily much to do with the reformation of morals, and is concerned for true human progress. The world is also interested in these things, but on a different basis. It intends to reform and save the world, not by the power of the Gospel, but by principles and powers inherent in humanity itself. It challenges the ministers to unite with it on its own platform. Every "great cause," every movement of progress and reform, it calls upon him to accept as being, without question, of God, and demanding of necessity the co-operation of the minister of the Gospel. It does this with the greatest possible plausibility, and the air of a superior concern for the moral improvement of mankind. Here again lurks the subtle danger of an identification with the world under its purely natural form. The minister falls in, as many instances in the world of politics and moral reform serve to show, with the merely natural and ineffectual efforts of the world to remedy its own deeply seated evils; and thus, forsaking his own true standpoint and adopting that of the world, he by this union cuts off the right arm of his strength, just while he seemed to increase in activity and power.

This will suffice to show what is meant by the danger of identification with the world.

There is great need at this time that this danger should be realized equally with the opposite peril of isolation. It needs to be boldly proclaimed and deeply felt, that whilst the ministry must be familiar with men and their affairs, it must, with equal necessity, renounce the world, and stand in detachment from it, in order to help it. If a want of union with men deprives the minister of the opportunity of serving them, a want of detachment from them does more—it deprives him of the *power* to serve them.

Much that is beautiful has been written about its being the divine mission of the ministry to "help" men, and the consequent necessity of standing in living intercourse and sympathy with them. The truth of this we thankfully admit; but add, that such communion with men, while a most necessary condition of a minister's being able to help them, is not the seat of his power to help them. That power lies in a certain detachment and standing aloof from them. "Give me where I may stand," said Archimedes, "and I will move the world." The ministry demands the same ποῦ στῶ, a footing and vantage ground apart. For it, too, seeks to move the world. It helps men, not merely by becoming one with them in sympathy—that is only a means to its ulterior object—but by being one important means of giving them that which by nature they cannot have, of lifting them up out of the world of sin and death, and enabling them to realize, as otherwise they never could have done, the true idea of their being. The "help" men need is the radical help of a new nature and a new spiritual life; and this the ministry can have part in bringing to men, only as it stands in detachment from them by a real junction on its own part with the supernatural world from which the help comes.

The necessary detachment, then, of which we speak, consists, not in any paltry external distinction of a uniform dress for the ministry; not in any cloistered seclusion from men; but in the deep interior separateness of the ministerial office in its own nature. It belongs to the very idea of the office to detach him who bears it. For it invests him with a power which, in his personal capacity, as a man or a Christian, he could never possess. By virtue of his ordination, he is "set apart," in a sense far more profound than is usually attached to that phrase, in a sense fully answering, in respect of the moral world, the demand of Archimedes in respect of the physical world. By virtue of his office (a distinguishing phrase, the truth and force of which in human affairs are universally acknowledged) he possesses resources over and beyond those of personal worth or piety; he is the medium of supernatural powers, and is able to bring these to bear for the lifting up of the world out of the fallen condition in which it lies prostrate and helpless. He is, in some real sense, an "ambassador for Christ." If the ministry is intended to "help" men in any special and fundamental way, then, it would seem, nothing less than the possession of some such power can answer, either to the world's deep need on the one hand, or to our Saviour's intention in instituting the ministry on the other. It is difficult to believe that our Saviour, in solemnly establishing the office of the ministry, in formally commissioning His Apostles and His ministers after them to go forth in His name and make disciples of all nations, meant nothing more than that His minister should be able to "tell men about Jesus" (which any Christian may do) as one in whose name they were not empowered to act, and whose grace they were not in any sense the means of conveying. It is one thing to speak *about* Christ; it is another thing to speak *for* Him. It is one thing as to act the private subject and friend of the Great King, it is another to act as His ambassador. It is one thing to tell men that there is grace and salvation for all that repent and believe; it is another to bear an office which has itself much to do with conveying this grace and salvation to sinners upon condition of their repentance and faith. It is one thing to seek to help men by sympathy, advice, exhortation and telling them about Jesus; it is another thing to go to the rescue of a perishing world and lift up the standard against the powers of death and hell in the strength of an actual commission from Christ, and armed by Him with sacraments and supernatural powers for the staying of the mighty evil.

We are well aware how fierce the opposition is to such a view of the ministry. To believe that the ministerial office includes any such powers is denounced as the deadly and soul-destroying error of "priestly intervention;" and this is done upon the so-called principle that no class or order of men, no office or institution, absolutely nothing whatsoever, must be allowed in any sense to interfere between the soul of the sinner and Christ. Man, it is said, must come to his Saviour directly and without any mediation whatsoever. It does not belong to our purpose to enter into the discussion of this question here. We would suggest, however, that the objection, as it is commonly made, would hold with equal force against all "means of grace." What are means of grace except institutions which, in some sense, "stand between" men and Christ, and through the medium of which they receive His grace? If "means of grace" are necessary, as most Christians admit, what is there to hinder an office instituted by our Saviour from being such a means?

Now, to bear the office of the ministry with a deep, practical sense of the divine powers present in it; to rely upon these for strength to help a sinning and dying world; and, trusting in these, resolutely to renounce all the plausible devices by which the world is ever vainly seeking to save itself; this is to stand aloof from men even amid the most familiar intercourse with them; this is to have the necessary vantage-ground and leverage for the true helping of the world; this is what we mean by the necessary detachment of the ministry from men.

It is sad that while so much account is at present justly made of the necessity of a minister's being one with men, the need of his standing aloof from them is so little appreciated; that, while isolation is so greatly feared, the opposite danger of identification with the world is so little suspected. So little sense of this danger seems to exist, that large sections of the ministry may and do fall a prey to it, without exciting other notice than that of admiration for the seeming increase of popularity, power and usefulness which is thereby gained.

There is no safety here except in being equally on the guard against both these perils. If it is fatally damaging to a minister's usefulness to be isolated or alienated from men, it is equally so to be so identified with them as not to stand, at the same time, in a deep sense, aloof from them. Indeed, if there is any difference here, the latter state must be regarded as more fundamentally injurious than the former, because a deeper and more vital point is touched. For a minister not to be one with men, is to be without the means of exerting his power to help them; not to stand apart from them, in the sense described, is to lose that power itself. Here, again, there is something in the ministry precisely analagous to a fact in the ministry of Christ, in which the former must ever find its own true original and type. No one ever identified himself so thoroughly with men as Jesus Christ; no one ever stood so entirely aloof from them. He was man, for without this He could not have reached men; but He was also God, for without this He could not have delivered men, even though reaching them. His oneness with men, by nature and sympathy, was the indispensable condition of His saving them; but His *power* to do so, lay in His detachment from them, as the Son of God. Thus it is in the ministry. It contains a human element and a divine; but it is in the divine and detaching element that the true power of the ministry to help the world has its seat. Oneness with men, for the sake of men; and detachment from them, for their sake in even a deeper sense; this is, we submit, a fair statement of what the case requires.

We close this imperfect discussion by saying again that, as no other office involves interests so high and sacred, so in no other profession are personal character and professional usefulness so peculiarly endangered as in the Christian ministry. The exclamation of St. Paul, "Who is sufficient for these things?" may justly be used with reference to the perils of the ministry, no less than with reference to its labors and cares.

ART. V.—THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

BY REV. JOHN M. TITZEL, A. M., IRWIN, PA.

"THIS same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." Thus, St. Luke informs us (Acts i. 11), two men in white apparel, angelic visitants from heaven to earth, addressed the disciples of Jesus as they stood on Mount Olivet, gazing up into heaven after their ascended Lord. The same truth Jesus Himself had announced to them, on different occasions, while He was with them in the flesh, prior to His crucifixion. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that the Apostles gave a prominent place in their teachings to the coming again of Christ, and that this should enter into the oldest creed of the Church as a fundamental article of the Christian faith.

But in the case of the Apostles this article of faith occupied not only a prominent place in their teachings, but it may be said to have in a great measure controlled their teachings and also their lives. And the same may be said to be true, likewise, of the early Church. The Apostles and their immediate followers in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ earnestly looked forward to the coming of the Lord, and continually regulated their lives with reference to it. For them, indeed, it was the great object of hope and preparation. Since their time, however, eighteen hundred years have passed away, and yet the Lord has not come. In consequence of this delay, His coming has less and less engaged the attention and influenced the life of the Church, until now we find the words of St. Peter literally fulfilled: "There shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." (2 Peter iii. 3, 4.) But we may, also, say with the same Apostle: "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some men count slackness; but is long suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." (2 Pet. iii. 9.) Though he tarries, yet will He most assuredly come. And this fact should claim our attention, and control our lives and actions, no less than it did those of the early Christians. Moreover, we firmly believe that only as the great truth of Christ's coming again is apprehended and realized by the Church, will she be enabled to perform properly the work which has been assigned her to do, and so hasten the day of her complete triumph over the world and of her participation with Christ in the unspeakable blessedness and glory of the kingdom of God. We propose, accordingly, in the present essay, to offer some thoughts on this article of our undoubted Christian faith, in the hope of awakening, at least, some little attention to its great importance for the life of the Church, and also, for that of every individual Christian.

That Christ will come again is taught, not only in the New Testament, but also in the Old Testament. In the latter, it is true, the first and second coming of the Messiah are so blended together that, if we were in possession of it alone, we would be left, perhaps, somewhat in doubt whether more than one coming was really predicted; but, reading it in the light which the New Testament Scriptures shed over its pages, the two-fold advent becomes very manifest. In the first coming of our Lord, it is now most evident, those prophecies which relate to the Messiah as a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, were only completely fulfilled; and a second coming is, in consequence of this, undeniably made necessary in order to the proper fulfillment of those prophecies which represent the Messiah as coming in glory and as an universally honored king. As regards the New Testament, its testimonies as to a coming of Christ still future are so many and so clear that it is utterly impossible to explain them away without grossly perverting their obvious meaning. The article of faith which we are considering rests, accordingly, upon no uncertain foundation in the Word of God. The whole Scriptures bear ample testimony to it, and set it forth not as an accidental and unimportant accompaniment of the work of redemption, but as its proper culmination and complete realization. When the Church therefore professes, as she does whenever she repeats the so-called Apostles' Creed, that she believes that Christ shall come again, she professes belief, not in a mere fancy of the imagination, but in a terrible yet glorious truth, which, sooner or later, will be realized in the final redemption of the righteous and the utter destruction of the ungodly.

What will be the nature and character of the second coming of Christ, we can learn only from the sacred Scriptures. The second Advent, like the first, belongs to a supernatural order of things, with which reason can only become acquainted through faith in the revelation of Himself and His will, which God has seen fit to make, from time to time, to His chosen people. Slight, vague, and exceedingly imperfect intimations of these great truths, the natural reason may, perhaps, be able to attain to—as seems to be evidenced in the Art and Poetry of Greece, in which we find the gods represented in human form, and read of them as appearing among men; and in the religion of Zoroaster, which entertains the expectation that Ormuzd will finally gain a complete victory over the dark power of Ahriman—but all history and philosophy prove that a clear, correct and satisfying knowledge of these things is utterly impossible apart from special revelation. And this is so, not because these things are contrary to reason, but simply because they are beyond the reach of reason in man's fallen and depraved state. When once revealed and properly apprehended, they invariably verify themselves to reason, as affording the most natural solution of the profoundest problems which present themselves in human life and the world's history.

Taking, then, the Scriptures as our guide, we note first of all that the second coming of our Lord will be a personal, visible coming. In this respect it will be like His first coming. This is unquestionably asserted in the words of the angels, which we quoted at the beginning of this paper. It is also evidently implied in the words of Christ Himself, when, in speaking of the last times, He said: "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory" (Mark xiii. 26); and more particularly in the words of St. John, contained in his sublime revelation: "Behold, He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him" (Rev. i. 7). In bodily form He came when He entered the world as a babe in the stable of Bethlehem, and in bodily form, too, will he come at the end of the ages. There will be this difference, however, that whereas Christ at His first coming came in the likeness of sinful flesh, and with a body liable to the sinless infirmities of our nature, when He comes again He will come with that body as it has been transformed and glorified by His triumphant resurrection from the dead and His glorious ascension to the right hand of God, and as it is now in heaven, from whence He shall come. That difficulties connect themselves with what the Scriptures thus declare in reference to the second coming of Christ, is not to be denied. How every eye shall be able to see Him, and how all shall be summoned into His immediate presence, if that presence is to be a bodily one, it is not possible for us in our present state of existence fully to understand. But the difficulties which suggest themselves do not warrant us in denying, as some have done, that the words of Scripture, as regards the event under consideration, are to be taken in their obvious sense; and all the less do they warrant this, because it is not even absolutely impossible for the human imagination to conceive how all these difficulties, or at least the greater part of them, might be made to disappear. Under no circumstances, however, are we justified in making our conception of the impossible the absolute test of truth, when this conception contradicts the plain declarations of divine revelation.

But the second coming of Christ will not only be personal and visible, but also glorious. When Christ came into the world nearly two thousand years ago, it was in lowliness and poverty. Though "He thought it not robbery to be equal with God, He made Himself of no reputation and took upon Him the form of a servant." (Phil. ii. 6, 7.) Though "all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made" (John i. 3), yet He was not born into the world in a royal palace, and as the immediate heir of an earthly throne. Though His parents were of royal lineage, yet the royal house of which they were descendants was no longer in possession of sovereign power, and they themselves belonged to the humblest ranks of the sons and daughters of toil. A stable was the birth-place, and a manger the cradle of the Christ! It is true, when He was born, "the glory of the Lord" shone round about a few pious shepherds who were watching their flocks by night, and the angel of the Lord announced unto them His birth, when suddenly the heavenly host joining him sang the celestial "*Gloria in Excelsis,*" which has been the delight and joy of the Church ever since; and shortly afterwards wise men from the East visited Him and worshiped Him; but to the eye of flesh He appeared only as the poor offspring of poor parents, with nothing to distinguish Him above His fellows. And this lowliness and poverty which characterized His birth, characterized His whole earthly pilgrimage, from the stable to the cross. Until He was thirty years of age He lived in the obscure village of Nazareth of Galilee, and was known only as the son of a carpenter, and as one who was a carpenter Himself, and supported Himself by daily toil. And even during the few years of His public ministry, though He spake as never man spake, and did the most wonderful works, yet He was despised and rejected of men, and could truly say of Himself: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head." (Matt. viii. 20.) The Jewish and Grecian and Roman historians of His times utterly ignored His existence, either because they hated and despised Him, or else because they were wholly ignorant of Him. But when He comes again, He will not come as an obscure sufferer, to endure the contradiction of sinners, and to be hailed in mockery as a king. On the contrary, He will then come "in the clouds with great power" (Mark xiii. 26); "in the glory of His Father, with His angels" (Matt. xvi. 27); "with ten thousand of His saints" (Jude 14), and "every eye shall see Him, and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him" (Rev. i. 7). He shall be revealed from heaven, "in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God," and "to be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all them that believe" (2 Thess. i. 8, 10).

Such, indeed, shall be the majesty and glory that will distinguish His coming, that at His name "every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. ii. 10, 11).

Intimately connected with this coming of Christ will be the resurrection of the dead and the end of the world. St. Paul declares the "trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed" (1 Cor. xv. 52); and St. Peter tells us that "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." (2 Peter iii. 10.) The same things are made known by our Lord himself in His various discourses concerning the last times, as these are reported by the Evangelists; and St. John informs us that, in one of the sublimest scenes of the sublime vision he beheld on the isle called Patmos, he saw "a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away; and there was no place found for them; and the dead, small and great, stand before God" (Rev. xx. 11, 12). Now it is indeed hard for us to realize that these things shall be so. It is especially difficult to conceive that the sun shall ever cease to shine, that the hills and mountains, those vast piles of masonry, which have not unaptly been styled "everlasting," shall melt like wax and disappear, and that all by which we are surrounded shall vanish like a dream and be as a tale that is told. Yet there is nothing irrational in our believing that such will be the case, as He who in the beginning made the heaven and the earth, and gave them their present form and laws, must surely be able to destroy them if His purposes require this. The earth itself, indeed, gives evidence that it may be destroyed and come to an end; and even unbelieving science is forced to admit that "the principle of degradation is at work throughout the universe not less surely, but only more slowly than when it combats our puny efforts." But the Scriptures teach us that the end of the world, which Christ's advent will bring with it, will not be an annihilation of it, but rather a transfiguration and glorification of it. The present order of things will come to an end, but only that a higher order may be ushered in. Hence St. Peter, in immediate connection with what he says of the destruction of the heavens and earth that now are, declares, also, that "we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. iii. 13); and St. John, likewise complements his vision of the fleeing away of heaven and earth, with the vision of "a new heaven and a new earth" (Rev. xxi 2). What will be the peculiar character of the new earth, we are not informed further than that it will be free from the principle of degradation which is at work in the present world. We are taught, however, that when Christ shall appear we shall be like Him (1 John iii. 2); and as we are moreover taught that the new earth will be our final home, it is reasonable to infer that it will be perfectly fitted for, and correspond with, the glorified bodies which we shall possess, and be, therefore, of a far more refined, transparent, and, so to speak, spiritual nature than it now is. In the change which will thus take place at the coming of Christ, we shall no doubt have the solution of many of the difficulties which present themselves to us now in connection with it. Much that under existing circumstances would be utterly impossible, will, under the changed order of things, not only be possible, but absolutely free from difficulty. The end of the present world, and the rising out of its ruins of a new world, we would further observe, are not merely arbitrarily associated with the second coming of Christ, but are necessarily connected with it. He may be said to have left this world and ascended to the right hand of God the Father Almighty, not simply that He might there make intercession for us but also because after His resurrection this world was no longer a fitting abode for Him. He can, therefore, only return to earth again, to abide here in visible form, when the earth shall be prepared to pass through the process of transfiguration and glorification, and so be made meet for Him, "whom," according to the words of St. Peter, "the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things." (Acts iii. 21.)

Viewed with reference to its moral bearings, the second coming of Christ will be a revelation, in the proper sense of the term. In this light our Lord Himself announced it (Luke xvii. 30), and as such St. Paul and St. Peter also speak of it in their Epistles (1 Cor.

i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Peter i. 7, 13). It will be a revelation of the person of Christ. While He was on earth, various opinions were entertained concerning Him. While his immediate and chosen disciples acknowledged Him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. xvi. 16), some said that He was "John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets" (Matt. xvi. 14); and there were not wanting even those who called Him "a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber" (Matt. xi. 19), and declared that "this fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of devils" (Matt. xii. 24). And this diversity of opinion has prevailed with regard to Him ever since. Though His true Church has ever substantially acknowledged and confessed Him to be "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man;" yet there have been those in every age of the Church who have looked upon Him as being only a good and wise man, supernaturally endowed; and others who have not hesitated to call Him an impostor, or, at least, an ambitious enthusiast. But when Christ comes again all doubt concerning Him will be dispelled. The veil which has so long hidden His glory will be wholly removed, and all shall recognize Him then as truly the "Son of God." This coming will also be a complete revelation of the nature of the work which He accomplished when on earth, and which he is still carrying forward in heaven. As there have always been differences of opinion concerning Christ Himself, so there have also, consequently, been differences with reference to His work. While His people have ever believed and acknowledged Him to have procured for them a complete redemption from sin and death, and an everlasting salvation, and have recognized His Church as "His body, the fullness of Him who filleth all in all" (Eph. i. 23), and as "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15); others esteem His work only that of a great Teacher of morals, and His Church as simply a human institution for the promotion of certain religious ideas. His second advent, however, will make manifest to all the true purpose of His first coming, and the greatness and unspeakable glory of the salvation which He has provided for men, and which is only partially realized now by even those who believe in Him and are really His.

At the same time, this advent will also be a revelation of God. It will disclose His throne, and the glories that surround it. His existence and almighty power, His goodness and mercy, His justice and wrath, will then be manifested in the presence of assembled worlds, as they never were before. Then, too, will His purposes in creation and redemption be fully disclosed, and all shall learn to know, if they never learned it before, that "He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." Moreover, in this coming, the true nature and destiny of man will also be revealed. In his present state man has ever been more or less of an enigma to himself. His origin, his nature, and his destiny, are all, to some extent, involved in mystery. Is he the offspring of God, as the Scriptures teach, or the mere product of chance, or, what is virtually the same thing, of evolution? Is his higher being—his spirit—though most intimately allied to the body, yet capable of a conscious existence without the body? or is it the mere result of his peculiar material organization? Is he destined for immortality and glory in a world beyond the grave; or, when his body is dissolved by death, will he "like a streak of morning cloud, melt into the infinite azure of the past?" All these are questions over which man from time immemorial has puzzled, and which still claim the attention of the merely scientific mind. Now all these questions will be finally solved for all at the appearing of the Son of Man. The nature and destiny of humanity, with all its possibilities for blessedness or misery, for glory or infamy, as well as the character and destiny of every individual, will then be fully manifest. And then, too, will be verified in its fullest sense the saying of the Lord: "There is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known." (Matt. x. 26.)

But in that the second coming of Christ will be a revelation of the hidden mysteries of God and man, it will also, necessarily, be the judgment of the world. "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory; and before Him shall be gathered all nations; and He shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and He shall set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the king say unto them on the right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. * * * Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. xxv. 31–41). Judgments have taken place in the past, rewards have been bestowed and punishments inflicted; and, indeed, these things are continually occurring in God's government of the world, and in His dealings with His people; but the final judgment of all, the final reward of the righteous, and the final punishment of the wicked, will only take place at the coming of Christ. With the final unfolding of redemption only can there be the final unfolding of individual character; with the harvest only can come the complete separation of the wheat from the tares, the gathering of the one into the garner, and the casting of the other into the fire. But at the final unfolding—at the harvest, not only first can, but there will necessarily, the full difference appear, and the separation be made, and each be assigned his own place. Thus in the second coming of Christ, all things will reach their proper consummation. It will not only be a mere visible appearing again on earth, but the full revelation and realization of God's purposes in the creation and redemption of the world, the end of the conflict between good and evil, the transfiguration and glorification of the heavens and earth that now are, as well as the absolute blessedness of the faithful, and the absolute misery of the ungodly and unbelieving. It is not unwisely, therefore, that the church, in the Scriptures which she has assigned as the Gospels and Epistles of the season of the Advent, directs our attention to this coming of Christ as a preparation for celebrating His birth as the babe of Bethlehem. Only as we realize, indeed, what is involved in the second coming of our Lord, can we properly apprehend how unspeakable a gift God bestowed upon us, when He sent His only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him; and so be prepared to praise Him as we ought, because of His goodness and mercy to the children of men.

But the question may arise, What necessity is there for Christ's thus coming again? Is it not sufficient, it may be asked, that He has already come and made propitiation for the sins of the world, and so opened again for man the gates of everlasting glory? and may not, therefore, that after all be a mistaken exegesis that finds in the Scriptures undeniable evidence of still another visible coming, and an actual end of the world? When we consider the character of much of our popular theology, it indeed seems strange that this question is not urged against the view which we have set forth, more frequently than it generally is. For though this theology mostly accepts the doctrine of a second visible advent, yet its common teaching that immediately after death men are either admitted to the blessedness and glory of the highest heaven, or else thrust down into the misery of the deepest hell, leaves really no proper room for either the future resurrection of the body, or the second, personal, visible coming of the Lord. But this coming is no mere speculation of the human reason, nor yet an arbitrary arrangement on the part of God, but a necessary result of His purposes in the creation and redemption of the world. The first coming of Christ actually involves in it the second coming, and in it alone can reach its proper consummation and attain its full significance. This a careful consideration of the subject, we think, must make apparent to all.

Christ came into the world to destroy the works of the devil (1 John iii. 8), and to become the head of a kingdom of which there shall be no end (Luke i. 33). But though nearly two thousand years have passed away since Christ offered Himself for the sin of the world on the cross of Calvary, and triumphed over death and hades in His glorious resurrection and ascension into Heaven, yet does sin still abound in the world and death claim its victims. Even those who through faith in Christ have received the forgiveness of sins and the power of a new life, have never yet in this world become absolutely free from sin and death. And as we find it to be now, so there is every reason to believe it will continue to be as long as this present world exists. We are aware that it is a very common hope that the world is continnally growing better, and that truth and righteousness will more and more prevail. While this may be true in one respect, it is certainly not true in another. While the good is, no doubt, advancing, the evil is also, no doubt, advancing with equal pace. Should the present order of things continue forever there would, consequently, be no complete destruction of the works of the devil, and so the purpose of Christ's first coming into the world must be a failure. So, too, Christ cannot be said as yet to rule absolutely over the earth as its king. His kingdom in this world is still a hidden kingdom. But the full realization of the purpose of His first coming requires that His kingdom should become visible, and that He should visibly reign and rule over it. Justice demands that the same earth which witnessed His deep humiliation and ignominy, should also become the scene of His fully manifested majesty and glory. But all this necessarily involves in it His coming again, and the conflagration and transfiguration of the physical, and the universal judgment and purification of the moral universe. Only the visible appearing again of the Son of man, and the destruction of the present order of things, can accomplish the complete overthrow of evil and establish on earth in visible glory the kingdom of God.

But the complete deliverance of man from the power of sin and death, also, requires that Christ should come again. Man is not a merely spiritual being. The soul is not the whole of him. His body is not merely an accidental, but an essential part of his being. His full salvation, therefore, requires the salvation of the body no less than that of the soul. The blessedness into which he enters immediately after death cannot satisfy all the demands of his being. This is, indeed, expressly declared by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews: "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect" (Heb. xii. 39, 40). It is also clearly implied in other portions of Scripture (1 Thess. iv. 13–18; 2 Cor. v. 1–8; Rev. vi. 9, 10). The resurrection and glorification of the body are absolutely necessary to man's complete redemption from sin, and his eternal blessedness. St. Paul emphatically announces this truth when he says: "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins; then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished" (1 Cor. xv. 16–18). That by the rising of the dead in these words the apostle cannot mean a mere spiritual resurrection, or a resurrection which immediately follows death, is evident from the fact that he connects it directly with the sound of the last trump, and the change which shall then take place in the living (1 Cor. xv. 52). But the resurrection and glorification of the body, because of its relation to the earth, also, necessarily require the transfiguration of the earth, and so the end of the present world and the coming of Christ in the manner set forth. For the body of man being formed out of the dust of the ground (Gen. ii. 7), and being an actual part of the earth, reason demands that its destiny should be bound up with that of the earth. On the same ground it may also be supposed that the incarnation of the Son of God demands the return of Christ when the earth shall be prepared to receive her king.

The world, considered in the totality of its life and being, may be said, likewise, to demand the second coming of Christ for its proper completion, and its deliverance from the vanity to which it is now subject, and the corruption under which it groans. "Speculation," says Nitzsch (Sys. Christ. Doct. § 216), "has been so far from opposing the Christian view of the world's catastrophe, that, had there been no doctrine of eschatology, it must have supplied the deficiency." No one, indeed, who reflects seriously and deeply on the condition of the world as it is, can fail to feel that it cannot possibly be eternal in its present form. "To suppose," says Martensen, (Christ. Dog. § 278), "that this material sphere of time and space is the only one possible, the only one actually existing for all eternity, would be to make the opposition between flesh and spirit eternal; an opposition which is not only in man himself, but in all the relations of man to the material creation around. And to suppose, again, that this moral order of things, ὁ κοσμος οὗτος, with its undiscerning confusion of good and evil, truth and falsehood, that this present *time*, ὁ ὅαἰὼν ντος, with its unsolved discrepancy between the ideal and the actual, with its restless alternation of progress and declension, of rise and fall, heaving like billows of the ocean, shall flow on and on forever through a purposeless eternity; to suppose this would involve a denial of all Teleology, a denial of the final triumph of goodness and truth." But reason demands a Teleology, however anxious some of our modern scientists may be to get rid of it. So, too, it demands that goodness and truth shall finally triumph over evil and falsehood. The songs of the poets and the predictions of

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

prophets of every age and every clime, concerning a golden age to come, clearly prove this. Such a view of the end of human life and of the world as that which Strauss offers us in his book called "*The Old Faith and the New Faith*," cannot but be revolting to every right-minded person. Notwithstanding much that claims to be in advance of the Bible, we may safely assert that the only eschatology which satisfies all the requirements of the human reason is that which is given us in the sacred Scriptures. The necessity, therefore, of a second coming of Christ may be said to ground itself in the deepest needs of creation, and also of reason.

While, however, a second, visible, personal coming must be considered as necessary, and, therefore, as absolutely certain; and while the resurrection of the dead, the judgment of the world and the end of all things must be held as necessary concomitants of that coming, yet it is not to be supposed that all these events will come to pass in a single day. On the contrary, the Scriptures give clear intimations that the Last Day will expand into a Divine Day of a thousand years, taken in a symbolical sense, and so constitute a specific aeon. At its dawn the harlot and the beast, the corrupt church and the anti-christian world power, will be judged (Rev. xix. 2–20), and, Christ appearing, those who shall have part in the first resurrection (Rev. xx. 6) will rise, and ever be with the Lord (1 Thess. iv. 16–17.); while at its close the general resurrection of the dead, the general judgment, and the final end of the world, will take place (Rev. xx. 10–15). The period intervening will be the millennial period, during which, an end having been put to the present course of the world, and Satan being bound, the Kingdom of God shall be visibly and gloriously established on earth, and the glowing prophecies of the Old Testament concerning Messiah's Kingdom be completely fulfilled. This view, it is true, is not by any means accepted by all, but we believe it is the one which is most in accord with the Scriptures, and which more and more, consequently, will be acknowledged as the correct one. We know that not a few expect that the Millennium will precede the second advent of Christ, and that it will be brought about by the complete Christianization of the nations, and of the arts and sciences and literatures of the world, by the church in her present form. But if we do not read the signs of the times amiss, this expectation will never be realized. "Politics," very truly observes Auberlen (on Dan. and Rev.), "are based on spiritual laws, and the voice of history proclaims distinctly that, even in our Christian era, politics are as much ruled by the worldly spirit of egotistical and material interests, as was the case in the old heathen empires; nay, that this anti-christian spirit is gaining every day more the ascendancy." With equal truth, the same eminent theologian declares: "In a general and secondary sense, one may speak of a Christian state, Christian art, Christian culture and civilization. Only let us guard against the idea that it is either possible, or that it is destined that Christianity is to Christianize in the real spiritual sense, or as the expression is often erroneously used in this connection, to transfigure the world during the present period of the world's history. Christianity exerts an ennobling influence on all spheres of life; but a transfiguration in the correct sense of the word must needs be preceded by a regeneration, a palingenesis; first there must be death and resurrection, even as our Lord had to pass through this path to his transfiguration. The kingdoms of the world must first be *destroyed;* then only is it possible that, rising in a new form, they will become Kingdoms of God and his Christ."

But if the views which have now been advanced with reference to Christ's second coming be correct, then this coming must be of the greatest practical significance. For if with it alone the individual, the church, and the state, yea, the whole creation, will reach their true destination and consummation, it can scarcely fail to be evident that the course of all these should be determined with reference to it. Only that youth that is spent with proper regard to the succeeding manhood, can be said to be spent aright; and so only that life, whether it be the life of an individual or of a community, can be considered rightly ordered, which is continually directed with regard to its true destiny. In full harmony with this view, we find in the sacred Scriptures attention called very frequently to the second coming of Christ, as a reason and motive for a holy life. Thus, St. Peter in his Second Epistle, after referring to the coming of the Lord and its attending circumstances, immediately adds: "*Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of* *the day of God*" (2 Pet. iii. 11, 12). St. Paul, in his various epistles, also alludes in the same way over and over again to Christ's coming as, indeed, do all the writers of the New Testament Scriptures; while our blessed Lord Himself makes His most solemn warnings hinge on the same event. Moreover, St. Paul, tells us that he suffered the loss of all things and counted them refuse that he might gain Christ and by any means *attain to the resurrection from the dead,* and declares that he pressed "*toward the mark for the high calling of God. in Christ Jesus*" (Phil. iii. 7–14); and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says of himself and the believers of his time, "Here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come" (Heb. xiii. 14), thus showing that they, as well as the patriarchs before them, lived with continual regard to the future world.

But to some, perhaps, it might seem that the practical benefits thus springing from a proper apprehension of Christ's coming are simply those which are derived from the doctrine of a future life, with rewards for the righteous, and punishments for the wicked. But this is by no means the case. The youths who act with reference to manhood, do not by any means act alike. The early life of the children of the poor and that of those of the rich is generally ordered very differently. And this is not the case simply because of the necessities of the present, but because of the different manhood to which they look forward. So our conception of the nature of the future life, and of its blessedness and misery, if we make real with these things, must in a great measure determine the course which we shall pursue. A right conception of these things, therefore, is always of the utmost importance. It does not pertain to our present purpose, neither would it be possible, to point out all the ways in which the view of Christ's coming presented, when properly realized, must affect action, but for the purpose of illusration we shall note a few cases. Those who are acquainted with religious history know how, in the case of persons who have simply made earnest with the doctrine of a future life, there has invariably been more or less of a tendency either to a false asceticism, or a yet more pernicious antinomianism; in the one case the body being treated as if it only deserved to be destroyed; in the other it being permitted free indulgence of its corrupt appetites.

Now, when the truths connecting themselves with the second coming of Christ are rightly apprehended, it cannot but be felt that both these courses are wrong, and that while the body on the one hand must be kept under, yet on the other it must be honored. So, if we consider the church in her relation to the state, we shall also find that in all ages there has been a tendency on the part of the church either to use the state merely as her servant, or else to set herself in direct opposition to it; and a tendency on the part of the state in the same directions. The history of the early church, of the Middle Ages, and of our own times, abundantly proves this. But if the views which have been presented of the coming of the Lord, and what is involved in it, be correct, then must both these tendencies be wrong. If Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and if Christianity is not destined to rule visibly the world in the present æon, then assuredly can it not be proper for the church to make use of the temporal power for carrying out her purposes, or to lord it over the nations in the way the Roman church assumes to do; nor can it be right for Protestant sects, as religious organizations, to meddle directly with politics, as many of them are continually inclined to do. Neither, if the kingdoms of the world are destined at the second advent of the Lord to become the kingdoms of God and His Christ, can the church be right in opposing herself to the state in the way some religious sects have done and are still doing. But if the views advanced require logically that the church should not lord it over the state, nor place herself in antagonism to it, so also they require that the state should not array itself against the church, or use her as its tool, but " respect the freedom of the church within her own sphere, and leave to her without hindrance the rights of faith and confession, of public religious worship and churchly discipline, of self-government and management, of self-reformation and extension, with all its consequences." (Van Oosterzee, Christ. Dog. § 134.) We might give further illustrations, but those that have been given must suffice to show that the doctrine of Christ's second coming is of most important practical significance, and on this account deserves to be carefully considered.

It remains to add a few more words, with regard to the time of that coming. This the sacred Scriptures most emphatically teach us it is not for man to know. "But of that day and hour," our blessed Lord Himself has declared, "knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only" (Matt. xxiv. 32). Throughout the Scriptures we are informed that the Lord will come as a thief in the night, suddenly, and in such an hour as men look not for Him. There will be, indeed, signs of His coming, they inform us, and these signs will become more and more striking as the end approaches; but until the destined hour itself arrives they will never be such as to enable us even to determine approximately the time, and to say with certainty, it is literally near at hand, or still far distant in the future. As man has continual reminders in the present life, in the sicknesses to which he is subject, and in the death of those around him, that he must die, but never knows certainly when the last hour will arrive, so is it also as regards the coming of the Son of man and the end of the world. Earthquakes and storms, political and ecclesiastical convulsions and disturbances, express judgments of God upon the wicked as in the destruction of Jerusalem, and signs in the sun and moon and stars, cannot but continually remind us that sooner or later there will be an end of all things; but these things cannot tell us just when, because God has not willed that we should know. Every attempt, therefore, to fix the day or the year when Christ shall come, by a symbolic explanation of numbers in the Apocalypse of Daniel or that of St. John, or otherwise, must not only be vain, but moreover wrong, and calculated only to mislead and do harm. Why this should be so it is not difficult to understand. A little reflection must make apparent to all that a definite knowledge of the time of the end of the world would not be suitable for man in his present state, and could only lead, as is abundantly evident from past experience, to utter carelessness and indifference, or else to such a state of things as St. Paul found occasion to reprove in the case of the Thessalonians. As the day of the Lord will be the consummation of all things—of the creation as a whole, and of every individual part of it—every man should, as we have already observed, live with constant reference to it; but that he may be induced to this it is necessary that he should be left in uncertainty as to when it will be. The words of the Lord must, therefore, ever be applicable to all: "Take ye heed, watch and pray, for ye know not when the time is" (Mark xiii. 33).

ART. VI.—PROTESTANT POLEMICS.

BY REV. I. K. LOOS, BETHLEHEM, PA.

We propose in this article to consider the Character and Province of Protestant Polemics and its Relation, First, To the Catholic Church; Second, To Protestant Denominations; and Third, To Anti-Christianity.

I. The disharmony resulting from the introduction of sin into the world affected the mind of man no less seriously than his body and spirit. The Spirit of God, having witnessed the disorder in the supernatural world before the creation, and the chaos* in the physical world during the process of creation, now hovered upon the face of a great moral "emptiness and wasteness and darkness," into which but a single gleam of light had as yet been permitted to penetrate. Revelation, which in a certain sense antedates the Fall, immediately succeeds it by at once bringing the powers of the supernatural world, charged with life and hope for man, dimly to his view. Heaven, earth and hell—God, man and the serpent†—here approach each other; God for the initiation on earth of His scheme of Redemption; Satan for its defeat; and man for—that perilous task—his final choice of weal or woe. The voice of the Lord God saying to the serpent, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel," gave birth on earth to a *warfare* that has lasted through the ages, and will continue, with a millennial intermission, till time shall be no more. It is the serpent's fang and the crushing heel of humanity—with the Son of God, first by adumbration and sure promises, and then by His actual Incarnation and birth of the Virgin Mary, in its bosom—that are perpetually warring against each other. Here we find the proper sphere of Theology—the first and the second Adam, together with their manifold relations to humanity, on the one hand, and the powers of the world to come on the other. Pagan systems have their mythologies, with their fables and presiding deities; Revealed Religion has its Theology, which treats of God, His nature and attributes, His works and dispensations toward the human race—all set forth in the facts and everlasting verities of Christianity. There we meet myths and mythical objects of worship, which have no history, because no real existence; here God incarnate, who could say, "Before Abraham was, I am;" who lived, died, rose again, and now liveth and reigneth in glory and is present with His people alway, even unto the end of the world. These facts we have formally revealed, in their historical development, in the Old and New Dispensations, exhibiting to us at once the ground and the contents of that Theology, one branch of which we here propose to discuss.

---

*Thohu Vabhohu.—Gen. i, 2.

† Nahash, the hisser.—Gen. iii. 1.

The truths with which Theology is concerned originate in God, not in the human reason. It plants itself upon the supernatural. In its Christian form it claims to have received its contents from Jesus Christ, who is Himself its Alpha and Omega—its all and in all. Mistress of all the Sciences, she is the handmaid of the Church, and whatever treasures she finds, she gives to man. The Church has doctrines to state, explain and prove, and we have dogmatic or didactic Theology to do the work. And as these doctrines are not for the understanding only, but for the heart and life, it states the duties which divine revelation has enforced upon us, or which may be deduced from its plain requirements. This gives us Practical Theology in its wide compass. For various obvious reasons, however, these doctrines and duties cannot be promulgated without encountering serious hindrances and opposition. They are not apprehended alike by all, and consequently held in various degrees of honor or contempt by the differently constituted and variously circumstanced men of one age, or of different ages of the world. Men are, in other words, differently related to the Truth. It has warm, zealous friends and bitter enemies, while others vainly attempt to maintain a neutral position between these two. Hence arise controversies with respect to the doctrines, precepts and institutions of religion. The management of these is the proper province of Polemic Theology. "The term is derived from a Greek word, which signifies *warlike.* A polemic divine is a warrior; he goes forth into the field to encounter the adversaries of truth. The word has an odious sound, and seems to accord ill with the character of a teacher of religion, who ought to be a minister of peace. On this ground, Polemic Theology is often held up as the object of scorn and detestation, and it is loudly demanded that the voice of controversy should be heard no more within the walls of the Church, that the disciples of Christ should bury all their disputes in oblivion, and, without minding differences of opinion, should dwell together as brethren in unity. There is much simplicity and want of discernment in this proposal, when sincerely made. It is the suggestion of inconsiderate zeal for one object, overlooking another of at least equal importance, accounting truth nothing and peace everything, and imagining that there may be solid peace, although it does not rest upon the foundation of truth . . . . Nothing is more obvious than that when the truth is attacked it ought to be defended; and as it would be base pusillanimity to yield it without a struggle to its adversaries, so it would be disgraceful, as well as criminal, in one of its professed guardians, not to be qualified to sustain the dignity of his office, and to uphold the sacred interests of religion, by his arguments and his eloquence. He should be 'able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.' If controversial theology be accounted an evil, it is a necessary one; and let the blame be imputed to the men who have labored, and are still laboring to pervert the oracles of God, not to those whom a sense of duty has compelled to come forward and defend them against the rude assaults of presumption and impiety."*

Discussion, says Morell, in his History of Philosophy, is the very bulwark of truth—the only safeguard against the imperfection of the human mind—the only chastiser of extravagance—the only antagonist of dogmatism—the only hand-post that points us perpetually along the path of moderation, which is most commonly the path of truth.

We see thus that the idea of Polemics lies in the very constitution of Christianity. This is a system of truth, embodied in doctrines which rest upon facts in the life and character of Jesus Christ. "Christ's defence," says Lange, "becomes immediately an attack. Earnest apologetics pass over into polemics." The Church, her creed and cultus, must be protected. As the Body of Christ, she is the bearer of life to men, the salt of the earth, the life of the world. She shall endure, she shall never perish. Her life must grow increasingly vigorous. Other orders of life have a history of a finished character. Temporal kingdoms rise, flourish and die. The most powerful earthly dynasties have passed away. The Chaldean, Egyptian, Assyrian and Persian empires long since saw their day; and the laws of the Medes and Persians, which once changed not, have all been abrogated by death. The King of kings issued His fiat, and they relaxed their hold on bond and free. Greece in turn has its dawn and glory, its decline and fall. Then Rome plays its part upon the stage of history; but civil wars close her heroic age, and a general decline her almost universal empire, in the short space of six centuries (300 B. C.–300 A. D.). This law holds true of all heathen powers. The same may be said of those politico-religious systems, which, acknowledging the inherent weakness of their own constitution, seek to appropriate to themselves saving elements borrowed from the Church of God. Their life is an amalgam, not the pure gold—like Nebuchadnezzar's image of gold, silver, brass, iron and clay, which, when smitten, brake to pieces. Islam rises A. D. 600—is victorious, but checked when it attains the years of an old man; and now in the distant East, the Crescent wanes to wax no more forever. Such is the order for things of this world. Cæsar is a man and dies. Christ is the God-man and lives forever. His kingdom, not of this world, is the Church in her career of peace and war—the latter always in order to the former*—in the life and labors, sharpness of death, Hade-an conflict and resurrection triumph of Christ—in the lives, warfare and martyr deaths of the glorious company of the Apostles and the noble army of martyrs. Her duration is not measured by years, her hair grows not gray, nor is the soul's *Alma Mater*, the Mother of us all, ever enfeebled by care. She delights in perpetual youth. Immortal, she is unfading. The gates of hell are arrayed against her, the fiery darts of the wicked are aimed at her vitals, but the shield of the Lord Most Mighty is over her and saves her from the hands of all her enemies.

---

*Dick's Theology, Vol. I. pp. 10, 11.

---

* Warriors, troopers, and what belongs to strife, says Luther in his Discourse on Education, also help to preserve peace and all things with their fist.

The name, *Polemics*, denotes at once the science of religious controversy, as well as the persons engaged in it. It agitates religious questions in order to obtain clear and adequate ideas of them. "Every article of faith is denied by some and cannot well be believed without examination by any." The shepherds, to whom the angels announced the birth of Christ, were on a holy errand when they went "unto Bethlehem to see this thing which is come to pass." Polemics investigates; it deals with false philosophy in all departments of science; it lays down theses and examines them, and boldly defends the truth as far as it is clearly known, while it attacks all errors that oppose it.

It has its highest warrant in the Word of God. "Many of the divine writings are controversial, especially the Book of Job and the Epistles of St. Paul." How solemn and majestic must have been the appearance of the prophets of old, as they stood in the presence of earthly potentates, holding their commission from on high—a "Thus-saith-the-Lord"—upon which to rest their assaults upon every species of abomination. The Apostles had a still more exalted inspiration for their work. (1 John i. 1–5.) They received the ministry of the Lord Jesus to testify the Gospel of the grace of God, and under this call shunned not to declare unto all men the whole counsel of God. They did not, however, attain to the truth in any magical way. They came at it by much study and disputing, always so led as to come infallibly to the only correct conclusions. In controversy with foes they were always right; disputing among themselves they always found the truth. At Antioch "Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them"—the Judaizing teachers, who were leading astray the believers on the subject of circumcision. And even after the question had been referred for adjudication to the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem, "who came together for to consider this matter," there was "much disputing" before it was ascertained what seemed good to the Holy Ghost and the Synod. Acts xv. At Athens "Paul disputed in the synagogue with the Jews, and with the devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met with him.* At Corinth he disputed daily in the school of one Tyrannus. From their writings we see that the Apostles early met and stoutly controverted various errors, among them those advocated by Phygellus and Hermogenes, who succeeded in turning away from the doctrine of the Gospel "all them that are in Asia," says Paul, 2 Tim. i. 15. These, as well as numerous other false prophets or heretical teachers, a crop of which sprung up everywhere in the Apostolic age with the good seed of the Gospel, were unflinchingly met by The Twelve.†

Religious disputation or controversial divinity finds its most beautiful exemplification in the life and labors of our Lord Jesus Christ. His ministry was an unceasing conflict with the enemies of truth. His Body, the Church, follows her Head in this warfare. From her earliest ages she has been called to stand upon her defence and meet her foes in controversy. Many of these were learned men, and only to be resisted by the weapons of learning and argument. Providentially many men of cultivated minds early became converts to Christianity. These, and others raised up by the Church, rendered efficient polemic service to the cause of Christ. As Christianity flows onward through the ages in an unbroken stream, we have an unbroken succession of holy men, who, at the sacrifice of all that men hold dear on earth, stood forth continually as its undaunted champions. After Christ, the Apostles, as we have seen, were the first polemics. Then follow the Apostolic Fathers, who were the immediate disciples of the Apostles. These were in turn succeeded by the Fathers of the Church, *Patres Ecclesiæ*, who flourished from the second to the sixth century. The knowledge of their lives and works constitutes the science of Patristics, with which we are not directly concerned here. From the sixth century onward, the Church continued to have eminent teachers and writers, down to the Schoolmen, who begin with the twelfth century. The object of their productions, from first to last, though frequently dogmatic (setting forth the doctrines of their faith), exegetic, moral, historical and ascetic, as in the case of

---

*Acts xvii. 17.

† Gal. i. 7-9; Col. ii.; 1 Tim. i. 6, 7, 20; 2 Tim. ii. 18, iii. 6-8; 1 John ii; 2 Pet. ii; Jude, &c.

Jerome,* is largely apologetic and polemic, designed to attack and overthrow the prevalent errors of the times, and to defend the Christian Religion. Warriors, thus, have never been wanting to the Captain of our Salvation. For every crisis the Lord, then as now, prepared one or more vindicators of his cause. As Ebionism, Gnosticism, Sabellianism, Manicheism, Arianism, Pelagianism, Nestorianism, and other heresics with their able promoters, successively entered the field against the Church, God had heroes of the faith, who at His call, sprang to the rescue, as in later times the patriotic clans of Scotland rose from hill and dale at the bugle blast of their chieftains, to repel the invaders of their country. Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus and Polycarp constitute the vanguard of this army of Polemics, to be followed by Tertullian in the third century, who, in his Apology for the Christian Religion, carries his attack into the camp of his enemies. Then Beryllus and Celsus affirm that the divine nature of Christ did not exist before His human nature, and Origen rushes to the front and in reply to Celsus produced the most complete and convincing defence of Christianity which antiquity can boast. *Erat homo pro fratribus certans.* Then come Cyprian, one of the brightest luminaries of the early Church; and Athanasius, who, roused by the heresy of Arius, with invincible courage, well supported by his holy walk, devoted his official life to the overthrow of Arianism and the defence of the Nicene Creed. Jerome,† Ambrose, the guardian of the Sacerdotal authority of the Church, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen and St. Chrysostom lead the way to Augustine, A. D. 354–403. He is the oracle of the Western Church and defender of her theology, and by his polemical writings on the Trinity, the Incarnation of Christ, and the Holy Ghost, and his well known doctrines of free will, grace and predestination, has placed succeeding generations under a debt of lasting gratitude to him. He is one the greatest men of whom early Christianity can boast. It was thus by the hands of these polemics, by means of their sermons, commentaries and treatises, that the Lord was pleased to guard his Church during her infancy and early life. Though not inspired, as were the Prophets and Apostles before them, these Saints were under such divine guidance that it may with truth be said, they wrote, preached, taught and fought under the supervision and aid of the Holy Ghost. By that aid they surpassed themselves, and were enabled to establish, in proper confessional form, the orthodox dogma, and to combat with zeal and acuteness all errorists who opposed it.[*] Condemned by heretical councils, persecuted by heretical emperors, wanderers upon the face of the earth, these early Fathers and Champions of the Church remained unshaken in their fidelity to Catholic doctrine through all changes of outward fortune. They lived in the heroic age of the Church and were worthy of their calling. The Christian polemics in after years, down to the Reformation, were in like manner men of divine selection, fully equipped with offensive and defensive armor to do valiantly for the Lord. With such a charge to keep, such a Captain and Bishop to serve, and the Holy Spirit to point the way, religious controversy could not fail in the past to render signal service to the Church.

---

*The catacombs and tombs of the martyrs, which had first inclined Jerome to the Christian faith, gave a sombre, melancholy cast to his entire life.

†St. Jerome is the guardian of monasticism, and contributes much to awaken in the West an admiration for the renunciation of the world and the celibacy of priests.

II. The second division of our subject opens an interesting field. Under it we consider—

First, the relation of Protestant Polemics to the Roman Catholic Church. The Reformation presents the Church under a twofold form, the Catholic and Protestant. Her formal unity is lost; divisions and strife ensue. In this mighty duel Protestants take the offensive; Catholics everywhere stand on their defense. They live wherever Christianity has found a foothold. They have introduced it into the four quarters of the globe. Their matins and vespers on land and sea never cease; they are like the *reveille* of the British army, continuous; for the Roman Catholic Church encircles the globe. Protestants follow in the path she pioneered, not to co-operate with her in the work for which these live and die, but to oppose them in it and fight them as enemies of true religion. Immense is this Protestant self-complacency, to which all that regards the church question and kindred doctrines is clear and settled long ago. To its mind, the Catholic Church is simply an apostacy from the true church, a heresy of the most malignant type, in the bosom of which no piety must be conceded to exist. To be *anti*-Catholic is *prima facie* evidence of being evangelical! The terms are interchangeable! Protestants have determined that Babylon, the great harlot, must be utterly destroyed. There can be no peace between this modern Israel and the doomed Amorite. However multifarious the doctrines and cultus, the credibilia and incredibilia of Protestant churches, they are almost a unit on one point—in the league against Rome. They agree that the ecclesiastical system of this church, which has been the channel of blessings to millions during so many centuries, must be combated and if possible overthrown.* They are hence not slow to enter the lists against Roman Catholics. They challenge to the combat, and if the battle is for some reason declined, they readily declare that their opponents do not trust their cause and fear the exposure that would result from the controversy of the frail foundation upon which Rome rests her faith and hope. And whether Catholics pick up the gauntlet so gallantly thrown down by valiant Protestant knights, or not, the battle opens frequently on one side only with a grand display of fireworks, a great clatter of arms, a flaunting of banners, and such a triumphant pointing to *Jehovah-shammis* and *Ebenezers* fifty years or a century or three old, as would lead all uninitiated lookers-on to suppose that the doom of those not on the assaulting side was already inevitably fixed.

---

[*] It has been well said that "the opposing sects and schismatics of the early ages of the Church were not only the outward occasion, by which the Church was led to utter, in the way of formal decree, against the manifestation of heresy, what she held as the truth from the beginning; but they assisted her in coming to a clear consciousness of her own vocation, and in bringing her dogmas to proper perfection for the understanding......In the symbolical settlement of the *Credenda* of the early Church, the fathers and apologists of the second and third centuries surpassed themselves. Between their simple and indefinite doctrinal views, which we find in their individual writings and the system....of the several Creeds, as we now have them, there lies a vast gap. The many in council assembled were mightier than all the individuals composing it."

---

* In *The Christian Union* of July 10th, we find the following very sensible editorial paragraph in regard to the Roman Catholic Church:

"The devil must laugh when he sees people doing his work under the name of religion. We see some first-rate service done for him by Protestant papers, that recount all the sins ever done by the Catholic Church, or imputed to it, and thereupon stir up their readers to fresh hatred of Romanists. Nothing is more powerless to do good or more fruitful of evil than this kind of talk. Its only tendency is to make Protestants and Catholics hate and despise each other. The fear lest our people should be bodily converted to Romanism is an idle one. The far greater danger is that the different elements in our population may be estranged and embittered by the action of religious zealots. On great questions of public policy, notably in the matter of education, the Catholic position is one which seems to us to call for strong opposition. But let these questions be debated on their own merits, and let Protestants not imitate the worst faults of their opponents, in wholesale denunciation of one great branch of the Christian family."

All this looks alarming, certainly. It is an open declaration of war—and war under the black flag. "No quarter given," is trumpeted into the ears of the foe. And great indeed are the polemical exploits against Rome. But the assailants of that celebrated *Urbs quadrata* are not always easily victorious. The foe is not to be run down with noise. Mere assertions, disingenuous concealment and false quotations are at a discount. Catholics have the same right as Protestants to ignore them, and to ask for proof instead of the air of contempt with which they are so generally approached. Right or wrong, they neither heed the threats nor confide in the promises nor accept the doctrine of Protestants.

Protestant polemics moreover errs, it seems to us, in generally treating its Catholic opponents as worthy of but little regard. They are too commonly spoken of in connection with the most degraded, and classed with infidels and atheists.* Crusades are formed and carried on against them with greater zeal than the war against open and declared enemies of our Lord. Even the Evangelical Alliance is a union of Protestants in order to a successful conflict with the power of Rome. They are, in the face of the history of fifteen centuries, declared to be enemies of literature, civilization and progress. They are "the ignorant Catholics," the willing "tools of the Pope," the "enemies of our liberty and American institutions." Archbishops, bishops and priests are "agents of the harlot," slaves of Anti-Christ, who sitteth in the place of God, etc. Their Church system is assailed as "a glaring scheme of tyranny, absurdity and imposture." And so on *ad nauseam*.

---

* Witness the following, taken from a work "adapted for Christian teaching," by Rector Bowers, of Kent, England: "There are now annually issued,

Of Infidel Publications		12,200,000
Of Atheistic	"	624,000
Of Popish	"	520,000

Besides 28,862,000 papers and periodicals openly vicious and immoral. And this in Christian England." We sadly add: And this classification by a Christian clergyman!

Impartial history lives. It holds the balances between merit and demerit, and while it records many and great sins against Rome, it has walked by her side during fifteen hundred years, and shows works which are an honor to her name and may well be the boast of unprejudiced Christians of every name to the end of time. Polemics against the Roman Catholic Church may as well first as last make up their mind that that church is no pigmy. She is a gigantic Colossus, with intellect in her head, devotion in her heart and vigor in every limb. Acquainted with all kinds of Christian and Anti-Christian foes, she feels prepared to meet them in every guise. With her ecclesiastical government perfectly organized, she has met heathenism in its most civilized and most debased forms in the four quarters of the world, introduced her doctrines and worship, and brought millions to Christ and Him crucified. Greece with her science and art, Rome with her power and military glory, and the Northern hordes in their fearful barbarism, acknowledge in turn her peaceful sway. She is inured to toil, suffering and theological wars; and while along her pathway through the ages lie scattered the ruins of evanescent and opposing systems, she has continued to live and thrive. She looks about her upon shreds of Protestant sects which once threatened to sweep her from the face of the earth, and which now only remain among us as curious vestiges of the past—" too sorely maimed to live, too strong as yet to die." In the departments of criticism, polemical theology, inner and outer missions with thorough organization everywhere, she is peculiarly qualified for her work. Her theologians and philosophers, literati and artists, find an unbroken line of ancestry stretching back under her patronage from the Rome of A. D. 1874, to the Rome of A. D. 325. They feel sufficiently at home in love and logic not to be led astray by the abuse of opponents or the dialectical effrontery of empty reasoning. A stroke of the pen, or a magisterial wave of the hand is not competent to " down with " this antagonist. The wish is often father to the thought, less often to the achievement.

There is reason certainly for Protestants of every name to differ widely from Catholics. We can neither believe all their doctrines, approve all their miracles, nor sanction their entire cultus. But what if they do hold the immaculate conception of the Virgin and believe in her assumption; consider some writings canonical, which we consider apocryphal; make great account of tradition;[*] impose celibacy on their clergy from the Pope to the lowest deacon; consider all separate from their communion as heretics and schismatics;[†] hold the intermediate state differently from the Hades of Protestants, etc.,—we surely cannot settle these and other points in controversy by contempt or the maledictions so generally resorted to. It is the *animus* of Protestant controversialists against Rome that frequently gives a bad odor to the cause they espouse. When arguing with Catholics, Protestants, of course, reject their references to the cut-and-dry patristic authorities, not admitting them to be authorities at all, and make their appeal directly to the Word of God, and sometimes to the Ecumenical Councils. They argue as Catholics in America, (see the Hughes and Breckenridge controversy), are willing to argue: from the premises more congenial to modern habits of mind. "*Tous chemins vont a Rome,*" says the French proverb; "truth lies at the end of every road of argument;" and certainly neither pride nor ill-nature should be permitted to turn any disputant from this high aim. It is in the memory of the present generation that the Protestantism of the United States has invoked the aid of the political power against the Roman Catholic Church. The nature and design of the Know-nothing movement is too well known to need comment here. Its effects, while it continued, were especially grievous to poor Catholics; but the sober second thought of the nation hastened to make amends for the wrong done to the imagined foe of our liberties, by the use of this unchartered weapon. That Rome has acted in the same way will not be plead as a justification of a wrong by Protestants. Extreme radical measures always recoil with fearful effect upon those who institute them. In our day the reaction of ultra measures has gathered new strength. Catholics are now found driving a wedge where fifteen years ago it was impossible for them to pass a needle. And though in Europe the Old Catholic movement has continued to spread, under the ægis of the governments of Germany and Switzerland, with the marriage of the clergy to tempt many to join it, there are, we believe, more Protestant ministers who believe in the celibacy of the clergy, than Roman Catholic priests who hold the infraction of their ordination vows by marriage justifiable. We see a current and a counter-current. In this age of transitions, "to Rome" and "from Rome" (not always equivalent to "Evangelical" or "Protestant,") designate the two great ecclesiastical tendencies. Though seemingly long, the journey even from the baldness of sectarian worship, via Oxford, to Rome, is frequently and quickly made. The Catholic Church is favorably situated to make her influence felt. She is geographically interwoven with all Protestant Churches, and receives recruits from all. She holds the Latin races, and in spite of all opposition—and by means of it—is making rapid strides among the Anglo-Saxons of England and her dependencies and America. Romanism does not *draw* these men, but Pseudo-Protestantism drives them. Even Puseyism—half-way house to Rome—with all its "papistical Oxfordisms" owes its rise and importance mainly to its arch-enemy, the ultra-Protestantism of the world.*

---

[*] The Catholic Church defines tradition beautifully thus: *Teneamus, quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*

[†] A heretic from the Catholic point of view is a teacher of erroneous opinions, contrary to the faith and blessed determinations of the holy Church. "Hereticus est qui dubitat de fide Catholica, et qui negligit servare ea quae Romana ecclesia statuit, seu servare decreverat."

But we pursue this line of thought no farther. It is plain that Protestant Polemics against the Catholic Church fails to accomplish its greatest amount of good. It might and should show greater results. Something is gained when we are brought to see and acknowledge that the sort of Polemics in which the Protestantism of the day lays out its main strength is defective somewhere, either in its constitution, or method of operation, or both. The negating ground on which it generally rests, and its reigning *animus*, comport not with a proper conception of the relation which Protestantism itself must ever sustain to her who is ever historically its mother, and ecclesiastically its sister in the Lord.

We come now to consider, in the second place,

THE RELATION OF PROTESTANT POLEMICS TO PROTESTANTS.

The design of Polemics among Protestants should be to elicit the exact truth in questions under controversy, to defend the truth which has been established by it, to increase the stock of divine knowledge, and aid each other in advancing beyond the theological thought of the past. The increasing divisions of Protestanism are not in themselves hopeful signs of the speedy unification of its various branches. They are not only separate and distinct, but like the members of a divided family, they are not at peace among themselves. They see not eye to eye, and the sectarian peculiarities maintained by one denomination and opposed with the utmost virulence by all the rest, excite mutual animosities; so that though we sometimes see brethren, with rare liberality, "agree to disagree"—the present climax of Protestant unity—they more frequently rush to arms to "fight it out." The desire for real union is seldom strong enough to break down the walls of partition between them. If any two denominations unite, it is, in some cases at least, for the purpose of coping more successfully with other Protestant Churches or with Romanism. The mutual approach in such cases rarely means more than, "Drop an arrow into my quiver" and help me against my enemies. Even such union is far more frequently proposed than actually accomplished. The time seems not yet to have come for real organic union among the churches, and every approach toward each other seems to lack cordiality, and to take place under a felt protest, all tending speedily to a greater *apogee* than ever known before. This fraternal shaking of mail-clad hands is always suggestive of fratricidal war. Is it more than an armistice? More than "armed neutrality?" Has the hatchet been buried, or only concealed? The clatter of swords may cease for a time, but do not Protestant combatants rest on their arms? The alacrity with which they appear on the field of strife, when their respective Shibboleths are not clearly enunciated, shows that the lull in the conflict, while legates parleyed, was but common courtesy, and the renewal of the war takes none by surprise. Protestant polemics like controversy, and fight none the less fiercely, because they fight against those who are Protestants like themselves. Owing to difficulties inherent in the Protestant system itself, they cannot anticipate such satisfactory results from their inter-denominational polemics as they can from the war against skepticism, or even against Rome. They have "no fixed point of departure, no settled object at which they should aim, and no definite method according to which it should be conducted." Morell says, "We have not yet come to have an authoritative Critical Theology as we have a Critical Philosophy." The well-known American phrase fully describes the consequent condition of things: "Each one goes it on his own hook." Protestanism is a general term, and has come to mean almost anything except Catholicity. Under its broad ægis men of many creeds, and of no creed, contend boldly for what they severally hold for truth. Each Church or sect, setting up for itself, advocates its own peculiar tenets, which in turn are attacked by others. What is established by one as *the fundamental doctrine*, is rejected by others as an unauthorized hypothesis. What one puts up another pulls down, to erect his equally unstable edifice in its place. The trouble is, Protestants have no common ground, not even the Apostles' Creed, on which to meet. "So great difficulties have they found in choosing a symbol of faith on which all might stand, that the simple expedient has been proposed of *getting rid of all symbols!*" Not a single article of faith is common to all. Our land consequently has become an arena of violent ecclesiastical conflict, where sects harass each other with an assiduity that speaks more of bigot zeal than of Christian sincerity. One exposes the Unwarranted Pretensions of Episcopacy, and in reply finds that he has roused a brother "to lay before the public the Anatomy of Presbyterianism." Then come Twenty Reasons for not being a Baptist, to be followed by a thorough exposé of the Modern Arminian Heresy, and after a score or two of other dissections and a grand display of scalpels used in this sort of ecclesiastical surgery, comes the whole pack, in full cry, against the fearful Romanizing tendency of the Philosophy and Theology in the College and Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States!—a Church, too, by the way, which is just now fairly taking her place upon the theatre of American Church History. The entire Cis-Atlantic mind is largely occupied by just this sort of Polemics.* No wonder that even Protestants declare: The history of Protestant

---

*Schaff's Historical Development, p. 95.

---

* The Form of Concord is, even among Lutherans themselves, a cause of discord and division, and the place where the disciples of the widely-differing schools meet with the least friction is in the Clerical Record and Statistical Tables of the Church Almanac.

Churches has thus far been—Protestants themselves being the judges—a history of heresies.

Men, it is plain, see differently—wear eye-glasses of various colors and different magnifying power. That which is red to one is green to another. "Seen through a fog, the golden beaming sun looks like a dull orange or a red billiard ball." Each polemic trusts his own sight, and is fully convinced in his own mind that it is his neighbor's eye that is not single. Honesty and candor, too—sadly rare in Protestant Polemics—would prevent much fruitless discussion. A large part of our theological controversies is occupied with the charge and the proof that the controversialists are misunderstood, and therefore misrepresented. It is a waste of time to refute what our opponents do not believe, to accuse them of maintaining what they do not mean to maintain, and what they think that they utterly reject. Misrepresentations are entirely too common. Terms are employed which are made to bear a number of very different meanings. The language of opponents, by not being fairly and fully given, is misstated, misapplied, its meaning perverted and misinterpreted, "thus perpetuating confusion and mis-knowledge on the earth."* Do the polemics, guilty of these practices against each other, believe in *piæ fraudes*, and act under the conviction that the end justifies the means?

Such is the case in this country. In Europe it is no better. A Protestant minister, Baron Starck, says: "In Germany there is not one single point of Christian faith which has not been openly attacked by Protestant ministers themselves." Men there, as here, are found daring enough to trample ruthlessly upon the sacredness of ancient and established authority. Owing to the changed condition of things in the trans-Atlantic world—the union of Church and State—the character of Protestant Home-Polemics is somewhat modified. In the United States the Church and State are divided; in Europe she is largely supported by the State, as she used to be in former ages. Then the Church was a unit; orthodoxy was defined and appeared as "an obligation which man owed to the State; heresy, on the contrary, was considered a political crime. In our day the government has no religion, and no heresy is criminal."* But none the less, on this account, does every "*Church*," or "Society," sound forth its party-criterion, and in true Procrustean style, give its own length and width as the exact measure of the true Church for all who lay claim to the Christian name. They will not allow others to drink of the Water of Life, if it does not pass through the hydraulic machinery they have constructed. To deny their assumed authority is to incur their severest censure. For "there are anathemas of Protestants which are not a whit less inexorable and hierarchies not a whit less unyielding than the Catholic."† All that is wanting with such a sect to exterminate all opposing sects is the power. Its spirit, christened by the name of Christian zeal, is a spirit of ferocity, less noble than that which decreed the Crusades against the Turk and Saracen, and much of the same type as that which, under Satan's promptings, recorded in blood the night of St. Bartholomew, August 24th, 1572. Any one reading the "hot and objurgatory pamphlets" with which modern controversialists flood the world, will find it far more difficult to believe in the Communion of Saints than in the *militant* character of the Protestant Church. We salute each other as brethren only to find that we are antagonists. How seldom do men of learning and piety conduct any theological controversy without losing their temper and flying from the main argument to personal and sometimes unmannerly reflections upon their opponents? In spite of advancing knowledge and civilization, we live "in an era of bad feeling, which, instead of abating, continues with yearly increasing acrimony." Men, with feelings worked up to the white heat, which, as in the days of Coleridge, is now "a constant temperature," forget that they have a Christian character to maintain, and the minister and the man are too often merged in the unscrupulous polemic. It is a doubtful honor to be an expert in "reasonless irony and boisterous banter—those heavy blunt weapons of disputants who abound more in scorn than in wisdom." Because of their different views on theological questions, men accuse each other of irreligion and impiety. Under such influences the brain grows large and the chest narrow. The exercise of the judgment is suspended, and the promptings of the Holy Spirit hushed by the tumult of the passions and the roar of the conflict. The house is divided against itself, and there are enemies in the Protestant camp. What tender sores and heart-burnings ensue! It is Protestant against Protestant. The spirit of sect and schism is let loose, and Antichrist, which is to come and *now is*, has an open field. Maledictions reverberate through the ecclesiastical heavens, while every petty sect sits ready to pronounce its decree, *ex cathedra*, to bless its adherents, and unchurch all who bow not their knee at its shrine. And dwells such fury in celestial breasts?*

---

* The Reformers, it seems, were troubled in the same way, and Melanchthon says, it is easy to pervert any statement: Nihil tam simpliciter, tam plane dictum est, unde acuti homines non possint, velut ex eadem cera, mille formas ducere.

---

* Hagenbach's Hist. Doct. I., p. 244.

† "After the Reformation there was a predominant orthodox Protestant Church, and over against dissenting men and parties, as during the first centuries in relation to the Catholic Church. Here then the Lutheran Church, in particular conducts itself with great harshness towards all movements of the more free kind, even when connected with forms so worthy of respect as Arndt, Jacob Boehm, Calixtus, and afterwards Spener and Francke, treating them as dangerous heretics, and rivaling Rome herself in exclusiveness."—*Schaff's Prin. Protestantism, p.* 55.

In old books we read that when persecutions ceased, men had recourse to monkish asceticism and a system of self torture, as a substitute for persecution and martyrdom. This self inflicted torture has not been needed by Protestants during the last quarter of a century. Some of them at least were harassed by as genuine persecutions and suffered as real a martyrdom for the cause of Christ—and that too at the hands of their Protestant brethren—as ever fell to the lot of those who suffered at the stake. Is there anything that affords so complete a theme for elegy as this suicidal policy? But the evils we deplore may be only an excrescence of the Protestant system. If so, there is hope of longer life. The astounding vigor with which inter-denominational Polemics is now conducted may after all act as a governor of its ecclesiastical machinery, letting off its superfluous steam, and thus preventing a possible explosion. Protestant Polemics thus, however deflected its aim, may be a "*sanitary* measure, affording an escape to the suppurations and diseased concretions in the living system. By its regular flow it does not gather and burst, but takes itself away gradually. This is preferable to rough surgery." The restoration of the health of the Protestant body ecclesiastic is however desired, and in order to it, Protestant denominations must sooner or later find some common ground upon which they can stand together. The Bible, that is, that which each sect with its own exegesis makes the Bible to be for itself, is not now that ground. Nor is any of the ecumenical creeds. These, under the dressing which each receives, form platforms upon which only one "Church" can stand. Each makes them utter for its ear the sounds it has determined to evoke. The negative, centre-flying powers are at work which tend to death. There is a perihelion to be attained. Positive centripetal forces must come into play, until all Churches shall constitute One Holy Catholic Church, the Body of Him that filleth all in all. With the pen, press, rostrum and pulpit, enlisted in the service of the truth, a brighter day for Protestantism will surely dawn, bringing a united Christendom to the help of the Lord, the help of the Lord against the mighty. Meanwhile sanctified Polemics, naturally the ally, should be so employed as not to become the adversary of religion.*

---

* Tantaene animis cœlestibus iræ?—*Virg.*

Third. *Protestant Polemics in its relation to Anti-Christianity.*

Faith characterizes all who acknowledge the existence of a personal God, own His authority, and assent to His revelation in His Son Jesus Christ, on whom alone they rely for everlasting life; unbelief, all out of Christ and His Church. It is Christ and Christianity on the one hand, Anti-Christ and Anti-Christianity on the other. The latter assumes numerous forms and names in the onward flow of history, and the friends of the former must ever watch not to be ensnared in its toils. Skepticism—especially ecclesiastical skepticism—is wide-spread in our land. We find here a conjunction of native American, English and Continental infidelity, mutually aiding and influencing each other, and well calculated to deceive and lead astray by the form in which it appears. It assumes the character of superior enlightenment, is a friend of reason and a seeker of truth! Its utterances are less frequently bold denials of revealed truth, in the style of the pantheistic Spinoza, than cruel half-truths, which are doubly mischievous, because not suspected of error. Its advocates seem to have arrived at the ultimate conclusion that the highest wisdom is to doubt![*] Worthy disciples of the skeptical Hume! The Gospel of Christ crucified is still "unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness." The god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine into them. (2 Cor. iv. 4.) They have eyes, but see not the beauty and power of religion —religion, we mean here and always, in connection with an organism that has life, the promises and the sealing ordinances; which is in short the bone, sinew and life of the world. · This they call *superstition*, and in backing away from it they slip into the gulf of infidelity. They despise the form of sound words, turn their ears away from the truth, and *shall be turned* (ἐκτραπήσονται, 2 Tim. iv. 4) unto fables.[†] This is the chilling skepticism which, now under new forms, leaving the legitimate results of scientific investigations, lays down hypotheses, and with these as its data, proceeds to establish an "advanced" science with which to assail Revelation. Like a torrent it overspreads parts of the earth, distinguishing itself everywhere by scoffing at the Church, the Word and the Sacraments, and sacred things generally, and a great contempt of the clergy, their dignity and authority. It speaks "lying words" about its favorite atomic theory, ignores a personal God and a moral government, makes man a combination of material atoms, possessing no soul, no conscience, and having no responsibility to a higher power, and no future existence. Here is work for the soldiers of Christ. Here is a real, tangible foe. And let it not be supposed that this foe may be despised either on account of youth or strength. It is not a new-born skepticism of yesterday, destitute of mental vigor. It is *der Geist der stets verneint*—a negating power, which in literature, art, science, social culture, and many material interests, has grown with the ages. In all its various forms its power is felt. In its effects it shows a confluence of all the corruption engendered by former unbelief. It is not a mere streamlet just starting on its career, but a flood that has been gathering strength through the ages, and that must be stemmed and purified. It comes before the public not in the disgusting forms of vice, though it begets this, but in the genteel garb of a science. Projected by the carnal mind, it has arrayed itself in deadly hostility against *Revelation and all that Revelation both presupposes and demands as its logical consequence.*

---

*Says Dr. Pressensé (Life of Christ): Christianity was never more misconceived than in our days. I will say more—never has it been worse defended by certain religious parties. This is one of the most serious perils of the Church; it is not only attacked by anti-Christianity, it is still more compromised by a spurious Christianity. . . . . Defenses of this gross and disastrous kind would long ago have ruined Christianity, if it were possible for our faults to ruin it.

---

[*] Augustine was no stranger to this spirit in men: Quod solent videre credunt, quod non solent, non credunt. Serm. 242, c. 1.

[†] Paine, in his low, ribald language, once said: "I have gone up and down through the Christian Garden of Eden, and with my simple axe I have cut down one after another of its trees, till I have scarce left a single sapling standing." What Paine regards as an axe laid to the root of the tree, proves, in the Providence of God, to have been only a pruning knife. Volney, Paine, Hobbes, Gibbon, Voltaire, Hume and others before and after them, who made the Church, the Bible and Christianity the subject of their hostile criticism and ridicule, have long since passed away, but the Church lives. They are dead which sought the young child's life. "'Οψὲ ϑεῶν ἀλέουςι μυλαι, ἀλέοδσι δὲ λεπτάϊ." The mills of the gods grind late (slowly), but fine.

"The antagonism, as in past ages, so in our own time, comes and must come from every sphere of the world; from the customs and habits of society, from the pursuits of trade, from the political circle, from art and science, from learning and philosophy, and from false religion. Christianity challenges the being of man to its profoundest depths. It challenges the entire life, intellectual and moral, social and political, literary and scientific. On every side, in every direction, the demand is penetrating, broad, uncompromising, absolute. "He that is not *with* me, is *against* me." There is no neutral position. The response is either faith, or unbelief; either self-surrender, or self-assertion. It is either a faith that carries with it the devotion of the whole man; or it is an unbelief that, permeating spirit, soul and body, arrays against the Christian Church all the resources of human genius.

"That these mighty hostile agencies are now active, assailing the citadel of our holy Faith with growing pride and arrogance, is no cause of *alarm*. As in other times the Church stood firm in the shock of battle, and came forth strengthened by the conflict, so now will she prove herself to be the possessor of an indestructible life. Every weapon aimed at her heart threatens her Lord, and will be broken to pieces."*

---

*Antagonism Perpetual, in *Reformed Church Messenger*.

Over against all these agencies of Satan, Polemics has a work to perform. It will not suffice to sit down under the willows and shed literary tears, bemoaning in poetry and prose the corruption and blindness of the anti-Christian world. Polemics must be both confident in its cause and courageous. It will not do for it to be held at bay by the cavils of the wicked and the sneers of unbelievers. *Magna est veritas et prævalebit.* Light seeks no communion with darkness; Christ, no fellowship with Belial. Christians have no reason to recede from the high position in which the Lord has placed them. A weak compromise with His foes is just suited to furnish weapons to unbelief. "Such is not the order of the Church's life; it is but a strange eccentricity, of which the greatest and the best Church teachers have always disapproved." The desire to meet skepticism half way springs from an error in judgment, and must lead to a moral fall and ecclesiastical cowardice, from which, Good Lord deliver us. Protestant Polemics, in the defence of the truth and attack of error, needs not fear the principalities and powers and spiritual wickedness in high places rising against it. Its work against error is one that demands the support of all hands and hearts for its accomplishment. But this is only one side of its task. True, it demolishes, and then clears away the rubbish of, systems that rose and have flourished for years, nocuous elements of which are constantly being transplanted into more recent systems. To war successfully, Polemics must not be negative only in its character and work. It must put something in place of that which is taken away. The error gone, truth must replace it. The heresy destroyed and its fond delusions dissipated, *the faith* once delivered to the saints must occupy its room, and give the misled sons and daughters of the human family bread for a stone and fish for a serpent. For that which is defective and faulty, controversialists must bring in what is whole and perfect, and that in a form to be apprehended by the understanding, for "the mind can only repose at last in positive dogmatical results."

There are degrees in faith. There are also degrees in anti-Christianity, and in its punishment. Some souls under the power of sin have deep, often unconscious, longings for the truth—reachings-out after it, as tendrils of a vine, seeking for support. Others wilfully blind, reject the truth and are hopelessly given to their idols. Polemics meets and removes the doubts of the first and resists the malice of the second. In the service it renders the Church in the conversion "of such as shall be saved,"* it uses above all, of course, the Word of God. This is indeed not the only weapon, but it is the best in the Christian panoply.† In its spirit of love, polemics war not against the persons of unbelievers, but against the corruption of their nature, the vanity of their minds, the waywardness of their hearts, the wanderings and apostacies of their whole fallen life. They seek to subdue the enemies of our Lord by love and argument, and to lead them from the grievous service of sin and Satan to the yoke that is easy and the burden that is light.

Our faith in Protestantism is unshaken. We like its aggressive character, without sanctioning the extremes to which, in its pseudo-form, it so often proceeds. The very constitution of Christianity demands Polemics. It has dangerous errors to attack and precious principles to defend. Owing to divisions in its own camp, its assaults upon infidelity are made, less with the overwhelming weight of an army than by the fire of platoons or individual men, which does not always insure a speedy victory. Powerful instrumentalities for good moreover, have been diverted from their proper use to Satan's service. A great portion of the secular press, shorn of its freedom and its highest honor by allowing itself to be subsidized by materialism, is now as great a power for evil as it might be for good in the service of Jesus Christ. The extent of its pernicious influence is fearful, as it finds easy access to millions of open minds, which the Protestant Church in her present divided condition, and consequent increased consumption of men and means, now fails to reach. By millions of immoral publications and prints

---

*Better: *τοὺς σωζομένους*, as in Acts ii. 47. The German Version also misses the beautiful idea contained in the original. *Die selig-werdenden*—those in the process of being saved—would answer better to the original.

† St. Augustine, not able to agree with his opponent Maximinus, as to the authority of certain Councils, says, in his third book, against him: "Let cause contend with cause, and argument with argument, on the ground of Scriptural authorities, which exclusively belong to neither party, but are common to both," I read the paragraph, in which this sentence occurs, through the eyes of Calvin.

Satan easily ensnares and destroys the unwary.* All that is sacred in the family, Church and State is exposed to his onset. And if the Church has ever been in danger of ossifying from sheer inertia, she is certainly exempt from any such peril in our day. Her sword, constantly whetted against opposing blades, is not likely soon to lose its temper. Associated with a demoralized press are hundreds of preachers, lecturers and agents, engaged in the same vile service. The war is constantly going on, but the scene of battle shifts. It is now in one country, then in another. The result is not doubtful. There are men who believe, or feign to believe, that Protestants will ere long be called upon to wage a religious war against the Catholics. We think it far more probable that Christ, the Head of His Church, will call *Catholics and Protestants to stand together* against His and their common foe—Anti-Christianity. A universal conflict may be approaching which will inaugurate a world-wide religious revolution, not abruptedly sundered from the present, or then preceding, order of things; but a development, ushering in new ecclesiastical relations, preparing the way for the steadily-confessed and believed-in ONE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, owning one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism. "Jarring dissonances would then cease and spheric harmonies would be the result." The birth to this higher life on earth will not be without pangs. "Before the end comes there must be a new *genesis* or creation, not to create a state of things absolutely out of nothing in contradiction to that now existing, but to bring order out of chaos—the Creator of which will be Jesus Christ, by whom in the beginning all things were made. * * There must be an ecclesiastical cosmogony, which, in relation to the sects that now exist, must rise far above the best any one affords, and far above also that which any conceivable combination or alliance of them all could bring forth." Events are, as some one has poetically said, even now transpiring, which make an era of every hour, and lengthen years of time into ages of the mind. Protestantism is at once the grandest blessing and the grandest difficulty of the Church in our day. This difficulty, also, Jesus

---

*The number of immoral books published annually is immense, exceeding by far the total issues of the Christian press. The present circulation of immoral publications, from one to three cents, in England alone, is more than 400,000 weekly, or 20,000,000 annually.

Christ, who is Himself the solution of the profoundest problems,* will solve in His own good time. Yet the most sanguine are sometimes confronted with perplexities presented by the present state of the Church. Is she prepared for the worst?—to do and suffer a noble martyrdom for Christ in the warfare against every form of sin and error? Can sectarian animosity, bigotry and prejudice be made to yield to a Catholicity that is better than the Roman or the Protestant? Do the colleges, universities, theological seminaries of this country—which is to be the theological battle-field of the world—equip their students for the conflict? Many teach them the Arts, the Classics, Political Economy, the Natural Sciences—to build bridges, canals, railroads, architectural structures—to tunnel mountains, analyze matter, etc. Do they teach them to know Jesus Christ, the key of all mysteries and a Prince and Conqueror? The Church needs heroes of the faith. "The army of the Lord of Hosts is already entering into the battle. To be safe now and hereafter, the Church must get well under the impervious shield of the Lord. We are only in the morning skirmish; our children will be in the Armageddon!"

We write from the stand-point of the Reformed Church, as we apprehend her life and doctrines. A close adherence to our confessional standard, the Heidelberg Catechism, with a proper recognition of ever increasing light and knowledge, will ensure both our progress and the preservation of the treasures of life and Theology entrusted to our keeping. Holding fast the form of sound words will go far to conserve "the doctrine," much the same way as we keep Christmas-*day* to keep the doctrine of the mighty incarnation, by which the Lord from heaven is made the second Adam, or the second representative and life-imparting man. By this means we keep a firm hold on the past, and make a proper use, at the same time, of the experience of centuries and the venerable wisdom of ages. We thus keep fresh in our minds the wonderful genealogy that unites us through a succession of holy men with Jesus Christ Himself, and through Him, with the Patriarchs and the earliest of mankind. He is the best protection against wicked devices and lying vanities in the present; the best guarantee of safety in the future. As against Anti-Christ, He will lead the Christian hosts and give them victory.

---

* See Dr. J. W. Nevin's admirable Papers on the Philosophy of History, in *College Days*, Lancaster, Penna.

CONCLUSION.

1. Protestant Polemics will in all probability be greatly modified in its attitude toward the Catholic Church. Men will more clearly see that Christ has sheep and lambs in that fold also. With much that is beautiful and true, she teaches errors that call for determined opposition, but, it seems to us, from quite a different base of operations than that on which so much of our Polemics against her is made to rest. It is too late to unchurch her by calling her bad names. In our controversy with her, we will not lose but gain by acknowledging her merits as well as demerits. Says an eminent Protestant author, "If Protestants enjoy a good loaf, it is because Catholicity furnished much of the good grain that entered into it."

2. The abnormal relation of Protestant Polemics to Protestants will rectify itself slowly. The conflicting schools of divines with their clashing creeds must come to cherish a more Catholic spirit and sink their fierce hate and zeal of party for that which is good. Augustine's well-known rule should be allowed to have some force: "In things essential, unity; in things questionable, liberty; in all things, charity."* When the Holy Ghost is once allowed to become the presiding genius of polemical theology, all this will be easily accomplished. The relation of the various Protestant denominations in our own and other countries to each other and to the Catholic Church will also find a full and satisfactory—may we not hope, a *peaceful*—solution; for we be brethren, and love better far to look upon a smiling lip than a wet eye.

3. Meanwhile Christians will not grow pale with fear when that which they hold for truth is assailed by anti-Christian foes. "Truth, like a torch, the more it's shook, it shines." We look in faith and hope to the future. No weapon that is formed against the Church shall prosper. And in spite of all His enemies, the time will come when Christ shall have dominion from sea to sea and from the river unto the ends of the earth. Then shall we have "Hallelujahs for Tragedies and *Te Deums* for *Misereres.*"

---

* In necessariis, unitas; in dubiis, libertas; in omnibus, caritas.

ART. VII.—PROTESTANTISM AND ITS RELATION TO THE DOGMA OF THE CHURCH.—*Thiersch.*

TRANSLATED BY REV. C. Z. WEISER.

FOR him who has already entered the arena of Christianity, and feels himself to stand on holy ground, the question touching his relation to the most momentous contradiction in Christendom falls nearest home, and carries with it, it may be, the most serious consequences. And this contradiction is none other than that which the Catholic and Protestant Churches present. The position which we assign to the designated antithesis may probably strike the mind as one too lofty and prominent. A few reflections, however, will suffice to clearly establish the fact that if, ever since the origin of the imposing Dissension, then verily in our times such a significance attaches to the different conceptions of Christianity as are held severally by Catholic and Protestant, and to the manner after which both the one and the other Church seeks to give form to religion by constant activity.

Let us, first of all, briefly relate the present *status* of humanity at large, and survey the circumstances and surroundings of the times by which the age in general, and the individual in particular, is challenged to new and solemn consideration of the ancient disunion and its consequences.

It is not to be denied that our modern humanity has become more *cosmopolitan* in its views and aspirations than it ever proved itself during all former ages. As the ancient barriers vanish before the strides of international commerce; as in the political arena glances are directed towards the universal constellations of the future, and indicate the necessity of a body-politic, which shall include no longer isolated nations, but the race at large; as, finally, in the sphere of science the way is breaking for a comprehensive understanding of the universal history of humanity—a philosophy of history—in like manner has a similar prospect opened more widely over the vast extent which the Church question embraces.

And even where the enlarged vision has not as yet extended, it is, nevertheless, fated to arrive; whilst all isolated narrowness, confined within its own poor walls, every opinion that bears alone on one's own peculiar confession or province, must disappear before the more profound and all-embracing sense, which, in its general survey of the Church entire, must share equally her joy and her sorrow.

Christianity is not commissioned to save the individual man merely—to quicken one here and another there by means of its life-giving Spirit. This is, happily, still possible amid all the imperfection of ecclesiastical forms and conditions, just as in the kingdom of nature oftentimes a single ray of the sun penetrates to a germ and nurtures it into life from a gloomy depth and scanty soil. Nevertheless, it is coming to be more clearly seen in these times than in former ages that Christianity is designed to unfold its complete efficiency by means of a *communion*. It becomes more and more apparent that atomistic dispersion and spiritualistic invisibility are not in any sense its normal prerogatives, but that Christianity is designed, much rather, to realize itself as a prominent organism—as *the Church of Christ on earth.*

In this light, however, we concede a significance to the question in reference to the conflict between Catholicity and Protestantism, of which proper account is not generally made. We may no longer simply ask, What does the individual man need, as the least assignable quantity, in order not to frustrate the legitimate efficacy of religion in his case? The question is rather, What do the nations demand? What is the sigh of humanity for? How may the influences of Christianity be vouchsafed to these in its most exalted and purest state? What form of the Church, universally and absolutely considered, are we to regard as the proper one, and sanctifying above all others?

Hence the dogma of the church has grown to such proportions that, long ere to-day, candid and profound theologians were forced to acknowledge that the bounds assigned to the theme, by our older Protestant dogmatists, are no longer satisfactory; that an inevitable necessity of the present times calls for a higher conception of the constitution of the Church—a conception built on the principle of a genetic development of the general history of the

Church, with special reference to the last three centuries, and on the universal wants of mankind.

But the conflict of the churches becomes a living issue for our times, from another consideration. We stand in the bosom of a preponderating *Restaurative Period.* Let us divest ourselves, for the moment, of all the political associations which cling around the term "Restauration," in order solely to notice the ecclesiastical and religious tendencies. The winter solstice in the religious firmament has been crossed. The philosophical century labored under a constant decline, down to the solstitial point, and terminated in a pining away of religious energy, a prostration of the Church and indifference towards all sacred concerns, so as to excite the astonishment of coming generations, as a phenomenon unparalleled in the history of the world. It is already difficult for us to transfer ourselves back into the spiritualistic atmosphere, which encamped around the generations of mortals nearly three-fourths of a century ago. Then both Churches shared a like fate, so far as it concerned the interior life of the vast majority of their several memberships. A suffocating incubus lay upon their spirits, in every quarter, which seemed to suppress all breathing after the divine life. The fact ought never to be overlooked, that the Illumination covered no less a territory in the Catholic Church, shielded as it was under the inflexible coverings of unvarying ancient formularies, than within the exposed plains of Protestantism, fortified by no such bulwarks of unchanging tradition.

Amid the later, more profound and religious movements, for which the present century is distinguished, during its first decades we have entered upon a period which has been styled the "Restauration Period." It is quite natural that, just at this stage, the defects, more especially of the ecclesiastical constitution of Protestantism, should fall home with far greater force upon the consciences of those whose interior Christianity has again returned, than had been the case before the neological revolution; for, during the interval, institutions have vanished, reminiscences have subsided and customs have been ignored, which no human power, indeed, is able speedily to restore. And yet such a restoring agency must unfold itself nevertheless. It must of necessity so transpire, little as many of the signs of the times seem to promise in this direction. In the nature of the case a reorganization must be effected, or, at least, the initiation to a genuine organization inaugurated. Such a movement must be introduced, first of all, in an intellectual way, by means of mutually profounder endeavors after a reconciliation.

Most ardently does the Catholic Church cherish the conviction that the season of refreshing has come. Believing that the spring tide has fairly set in, she neglects not to apply her reserved forces in the service of a restoring energy. But just at this point the sad fact confronts us, that the inquiry never for a moment even arises, Whether the problem, which Providence assigns her, may not be, precisely at this favorable juncture, to convert the restaurative energy into a reforming agency at the same time, and to adapt the following of circumstances, which has transpired, to a moderating of that rigor under which the nations have groaned during whole centuries, and against which entire provinces have rebelled and broken away, during the Reformation age, as if in just visitation on the ancient Church. The auspicious moment for the Catholic Church to come to herself, to inquire after the causes of the still exciting anomaly of disunion and to initiate a Reform, on the basis of a purer knowledge of the Gospel and gentle mode of transformation—that favorable moment dawned at the opening of the present century. Nor may all opportunities to such an end be even now past redemption. Catholicity might, in this way, have assimilated all genuine Protestantism to itself. The direful necessity of witnessing Protestantism outside and alongside of itself, as an antagonistic force, might have been spared it, and the Catholic Church would have achieved a victory over the ruins of Protestantism, in a spiritual manner, which would have proven a triumph for the kingdom of Christ and the precursor to a more glorious future for the Universal Church.

But the Catholic Church did not embrace the golden opportunity extended to her hand, and her later measures well nigh crush out the last glimmer of hope for a remodeling of her constitution. It is manifest, on all sides, that the restoration of Catholicity is meant to follow narrowly in the ancient grooves. The Catholic Church builds her hope of salvation in the revival of the Religious Order whose suppression was rendered a necessity by reason of the disaffection of the masses. When, for a brief period, through the instrumentality of such divines as Mœhler, in Germany, a refined renovation of Catholic theology, and upon a truly religious basis, seemed to dawn, presently the hierarchico-political view of Catholicity was revived, in the strictest medieval sense, in opposition to all the presentiments of those spirits from whom the admirable movement emanated; and on the premature death of those really religio-ecclesiastical divines, others came to the helm, whom we, by way of distinction, may properly denominate political-ecclesiastical. The repairing momenta of still earlier times, in the bosom of Catholicity—Jansenism, Gallicanism, Episcopalianism—lay buried in oblivion and contempt, and the giant minds who essayed to apply the speculative-religious theory to Catholic dogmas, recede with their disciples, a diminishing minority. In the room of all now, we witness bishops themselves reviving, with singular zeal, precisely those unprimitive measures which had previously rendered the Reformation a necessity, in consequence of their extravagance, and produced the monstrous rent in Christendom.

Shall we, likewise, who occupy Protestant ground, adopt a similar course, and maintain an *unconditional return* to all the forms and statutes of primitive Protestanism, of Reformed or Lutheran type, to be the only way to a solution of the problem of the age? We need not stop to specify the class, who, feeling themselves moved to embrace a religious life by the workings of the Spirit of Christ, so greatly experienced in these times, have employed their liberty in deciding in favor of an absolute restauration, and after this manner hope to render most salutary service to the Church of Christ, meaning thereby the Protestant Church of their mind, or Lutheran. Let us not ignore the fact that with such, who lead the van in this direction, it is verily a deep sense of the purity and strength of ancient Protestant dogmas, in consequence of which they feel themselves driven to defend them in their entire ancient scholastico-polemical crudeness, to revive every formula and institution, however remotely related, and to confine themselves strictly, in doctrine and life, within the limits which a Protestantism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had assigned for itself. But just as little may we ignore the truth that already a vast crowd of imitators has encamped about the leading spirits as a magnet, who imagine nothing to be easier, and, therefore, nothing more imperative, than at once and unreservedly to plunge into the restaurative stream, and thus prove themselves to differ in no way, in principle, from the Ultramontanes in the Catholic Church. For the former, like the latter, in thus endeavoring to reinstate, without the slightest modification, an earlier *status* of ecclesiastical evolution, do their utmost to prove that they too, in spite of the long course of humiliation, sorrow and chastening which the Church has experienced, "have neither learned nor forgotten anything."

Our mind is far otherwise. If the *Catholic* Church finds herself placed in the galling stocks of restraint and fixity, and the warnings and experiences of centuries bring her no new lessons, the *Protestant* Church, which precisely, in consequence of her freedom and unbridledness, has been subject to greater wanderings, is now, in turn, challenged to make due account of her liberty likewise, which the wisdom of experience demands at her hands, and to establish in a real way, that the course of tribulation has not been without its lessons.

Let it be premised, however, once for all, that such a readiness to concede early defects and errors in Protestantism on the one side, as well as the disposition on the other, to appropriate new ideas, which the fields of history and the holy Scriptures lay open, and which accrue to us as a gain from the trying events more recently occurring:—all this is not to betray itself in a restless and precipitate likeness, in the sphere of practical life, but immediately only in the intellectual sphere, as a real advancement in knowledge and as a reconstruction of our whole theory.

In reference to a solution of the *practical* questions of the day, the position of such may be, in a measure, tenable, as assume that, inasmuch as the present era has thus far produced nothing that is acknowledged to be superior or more test-abiding, it is consequently the part of prudence to return to the ancient forms and usages of orthodox Protestantism, at once, in matters *e. g.* of Cultus or the Evangelization of the masses. This much is certain, at all events, that wherever such usages still remain on the strength of an unbroken tradition, forbearance is a duty; and in case the sole alternative is, either to continue the innovations of a neological age, or to exchange them for Primitive Protestant forms, the latter merit a decided preference. Such a conservative conduct, however, must be met by a most decided and self-denying zeal of the spirit for the effecting and maturing of *genuine ideas of Reform.* He that judges himself shall not be judged. Instead of simply reinstating the former regimen of Dogmatics by one stroke, and erecting it as authority, we are called upon to assume to *ourselves* the office of censor, rather than surrender its rigid criticism to the enemies of Christianity. So too are we challenged, with unrelenting vigor and love for the truth, voluntarily to acknowledge the defects in the Protestant Church, and by means of such a disposition of self-condemnation, to disarm those who would otherwise find their pleasure in uncovering our faults with unsparing hand, precisely in the degree we might fancy ourselves exalted beyond every needed reformation.

Such then being the task which confronts us—and who will not indeed concede it to be one of the chief, if not the chief problem embraced within the circle of a believing Protestant Theology of our times?—a clear conception of Catholicity, as well as a comparison between itself and Protestantism, will be of chief moment towards our discharging it, in addition to our resorting to the Holy Scriptures and Christian Antiquity. For so much will be admitted by all, however many defects and perversities they may recount in our Protestant relations, that the advantages to these defects may be found to exist in the Catholic Church precisely after the measure in which, *vice versa*, principles rule in the Protestant Churches, whose free admittance and faithful organic application would prove the removing and healing remedy to many principal evils in Catholicity.

And let us remark, that not a few of the most discerning minds in our ranks have made confession of such a proposition, not only in a general way, but have traced it in a most definite manner in reference to very many individual points. This has occurred not alone in England, where we witness in the bosom of the Anglican Churches a most instructive confirmation of this view, notwithstanding the wandering astray in which it resulted in that quarter. In Germany, likewise, we may designate a class of Protestants, by no means trivial in number and significance, who have felt themselves forced to acknowledge that the Protestant Church, in her existing *status* and as a totality, can in no sense be regarded as congruent with the Primitive Church, and that a better insight into the constitution of Catholicity, along with a consequent comparison drawn between it and Protestantism, will serve in large measure to discover the defects in the latter.

The more vehemently the sad antipathies of old break forth afresh; the more decidedly many opposing parties return to the polemical issues of by-gone centuries, the greater is the obligation for the Protestant theologian to wring out a verdict established on a foundation of justice and love for the truth; and the happier will be his lot, at the same time, to feel himself possessed of a system of Irenics, resting upon sound judgment, rather than on effeminacy and weakness.

The duty of presenting the antithesis of the Churches in an *irenical* light should ever be felt and kept in mind; nor should any one hesitate to advance in this direction as far as the facts will suggest to a mind candid and open to conviction. A mere word is all that is needed, in reference to the jeopardy in which such an attitude may be supposed by the reader to involve us. The Protestant mind is in such a state, whether we regard the noble or ignoble class, as to hail the bare utterance of a *Romanizing tendency* with reproach and condemnation—so completely has all sense and taste for what is truly Catholic been eliminated from the reigning current of thought. But to make due account of primitive Catholic ideas, under the form of themes for our current theology, is anything rather than a renunciation of the right of Polemics over against pseudo-Catholic elements; it is something widely different from the surrender of the principle of Protestantism into the lap of the Roman Church. Much more does such a protest gain in permanence and force, because it rests on the basis of legitimate concessions going before. All ebullition of rashness and passion in the sphere of Polemics generates a lasting prejudice against the interior truth.

The true Irenic, however, after having done his utmost to allay prejudice in himself and others, is entitled to the highest credit, by virtue of his unfettered and purified consciousness, fully as much so as a Polemics that is emancipated from the fetters of passion.

It were an easier task to convince the timid that their apprehensions would have more ground in reference to such whose whole being seems to develop in confessional warfare. How readily might we specify individuals, reared and matured under an ultra Protestant conciousness, and filled with ignorance, prejudice and hatred against everything Catholic, who felt themselves wholly disarmed in their opposition as soon as Roman Catholicity confronted them directly in its imposing form, and were constrained to render unreserved homage to its authority. He alone who has once, at least, ventured to survey the whole domain of Catholicity, as well as the degeneration of Protestantism, in its full extent, is prepared with equal decision to protest against the spurious elements in the Roman Church, and with a truly manly independence to refuse his submission thereto.

We stand in the bosom of an age when independence and ripeness of judgment in ecclesiastical matters becomes an imperative duty for the theologian, not only for his individual benefit and the government of his conduct towards his confessional antagonists, but when the divine also is frequently called to act the part of an adviser, more so than formerly; for such as are aroused and alarmed because of the ecclesiastical collisions of our times, and seek light on the questions of conscience imposing themselves, as well as a prudent direction of judgment and conduct. On this account already should we feel ourselves urged to devote thought and reflection to this subject, in order to lay claim, during such junctures, in good faith, to the confidence of those who pray our counsel.

The age demands a nobler conception of Catholicity and Protestantism, as well as a better understanding of the relation which both sustain to the Primitive Christian and Ancient Catholic Church. The necessity of such a revision of the entire movement in progress for the last three hundred and more years, presses upon us from every quarter, and the times claim a preservation of the treasure buried along the line of revolution. And the Present is not only obliged to render a proper and intelligent solution of the great problem, but is likewise *equal* to the task imposed, perhaps, to a degree beyond any former period. In the general world-relations, and more especially in the existing state of German Literature, the preliminary conditions are delivered to hand, by which the desired result may be reached, not indeed by every one, but by the Protestant divine, in case, at all events, a positive Christian conviction, along with a spirit emancipated from denominational prejudices, can be yoked with a scientific endeavor. A glance at former generations, those immediately succeeding the rupture of the Church, will show how far they fall behind the present age, touching the readiness to arrive at a true conception and proper appreciation of the momentous ecclesiastical contradiction.

There are periods in the world's history when essentially new factors come to the surface. The more powerfully a novelty impresses itself upon the masses, the more decidedly they are swept along by the paroxysm of a momentary impulse, the less competent is that epoch to pronounce judgment upon itself or to render a safe opininion on the moving causes. Such a verdict becomes possible only in the measure after which events pass into history, and the following generations, coming upon the scene, are no longer controlled by any prejudice, for or against the contradictions of the past. This may then be affirmed, with special emphasis, of the *Reformation Period.* The autobiographical utterance which that age pronounced on itself, can in no sense serve as a canon for all after ages. We may understand the preliminaries and circumstances, which should necessarily draw after them the notion which, when once enkindled by the few, should seize upon the masses, that Anti-Christ is to be slain in the Pope, and the Babylon of the Apocalypse in the Roman Church. It were easy to trace the incalculable influence which such a rendering exerted in bringing about the Reformation in general, and, more especially, in bringing it to a head under just such a form ; an interpretation preluded during previous centuries, sufficiently frequently declared by the earlier opponents of the Catholic Church, and skillfully applied by the Reformers as one of their most effective weapons. There were times and circumstances, *e. g.*, the Religious Wars and the Persecution of Protestants in France, when it would have argued more than human wisdom and sacrifice not to have cherished such an idea. Nevertheless, we are at all times constrained to acknowledge that views of this order, so confidently promulgated, can scarcely fail to produce, in the masses at least, the bitterest hatred, a fearful and fanatical extreme which, in turn, will verily exert a powerful influence, but will at the same time greatly disturb the purity of the issue.

We may not as yet subject the responsibility of those characters to a critical test, who by means of such an order of Polemics enkindled a rash and antagonistic fanaticism, whether intentionally or not, among the masses. Still so much is clear, that the more the heat of the on-setting conflict with the world power of the Papacy excused this tone, the less may we accept the verdict of that age as the final and objectively correct one. The Reformers, and particularly *Luther*, were firm in their conviction, that the battle in which they had enlisted would prove the final battle in the world's history, the decisive crisis upon which the Judgment would speedily supervene. At the Advent of the final conflict, however, the powers of good and evil in humanity will have their lines of demarcation more sharply defined than they ever yet arrayed themselves before. Hence the conviction, that on the opposite side the blackness of darkness reigned exclusively, had fixed itself sincerely in the minds of thousands, at least at the dawn of the Reformation. Nor indeed were the leaders in the onset wholly free from a too flattering hope in the workings of the Gospel. But after a very brief experience, they found their hope doomed to a bitter disappointment. It is known what agony a *Luther* and a surviving *Melanchthon* endured, in consequence of the degeneration that befel their reformatory work, and the rapid dissolution of the modern Church.

After the foremost violent storms, which followed in the wake of the Reformation, had calmed, and the early dawning dissension among the Reformers had been provisionally quelled, then, as the venerable *Earnest Valentine Löscher* remarks, an alarming decline of primitive zeal and exemplary morals set in within the circle of Protestant congregations, more especially A. D. 1539. And is it purely accidental that, across the line, the founding of the Order of the Jesuits should quite simultaneously occur, by which a deeply shattered Catholicity experienced a revival that asserted itself during all subsequent ages?

These primal experiences might have proven of sufficient force to render the conviction general among Protestants, that as little as an exclusive day reigned on one side, so little had a total night set in on the other. Nevertheless, the view of the Pope as Anti-Christ or Beast of Perdition, and of the Church of Rome as Babylon, maintained itself echo-like from out of the earlier storms of conflict throughout ancient Protestantism, even down through the entire era of strict, tenacious and unrelenting orthodoxy; and, indeed, wherever the Formulas of the Reformation retained their primitive tone most fully, in many provinces of the Reformed Church, such as England, Scotland and North America, the stereotyped prejudice has propagated itself even down to our day, and is intervoven with erroneous commentaries of the Apocalypse. It is clear that no room is afforded for a consideration of the real merits of the controversy, so long as such a bold defiance is bidden to all instructions of modern history.

Nor was it solely the original crudeness that rendered it impossible for Primitive Orthodoxy to arrive at a calm judgment in reference to its adversary or even itself; it was owing no less to the almost entire want of a proper conception of science in general, a want which undeniably extended itself over the entire field of knowledge, even throughout the two centuries succeeding the Reformation. As all theology, more particularly in the Lutheran Church, had been absorbed and monopolized in the service of Polemics, an adoption of the features of early Christianity, conducted after a truly historical order, as well as a calm inspection of the entire historical evolution, was wholly impossible, and the highest erudition in the spheres of history and philosophy, which had attained to such a surprising eminence in the cultivated leaders in the expiring XVI. the XVII., and during the dawn of the XVIII., centuries, failed to reach its rightful and proper end. Since even the Exegesis of the holy Scriptures, with every profusion of learning, was degraded towards a polemical end, much less would the church be expected to be prevented from any historically objective stand-point. History too had its significance only in so far as it answered as an arsenal inexhaustible for thelogico-confessional controversies.

Two men tower above their companions, among the divines in the Lutheran Church, as we hold, and excel in genuine historical culture, as well as in a truly irenical disposition—two qualifications that are inseparable--*Philip Melanchthon* and *John George Calixtus.*

And if ever divines arose, whose age may be said to have denied proper credit for noble endeavors and for a scientific presentation of their views, it may be affirmed of the two individuals named. It was, without controversy, his familiarity with Christian Antiquities, in unison with a higher view of the Church universal, which led a *Melanchthon*, and a century later, a *Calixtus*, to such irenical positions. *Melanchthon* clearly foresaw the dissolution of relations that awaited the Protestant Churches by virtue of a surrender of all primitive and fixed formulas of confession and discipline. Gladly would he have secured the unity of the Church, at any cost, even by recognizing the Pope as the highest human authority—save only at the sacrifice of the pure doctrine of the Gospel. But his feeble voice was drowned amid the tempestuous age, and his disciples, not all of whom had inherited their master's deep piety, were silenced by the tyrannic power of Luther's more rigid school.

Through personal observation *Calixtus* gained a knowledge of the Church in Reformed and Catholic countries, wholly different from that of the inconsiderate polemical leaders of his day. By a diligent study of Church history he awakened within himself an ideal of the Primitive Catholic Church, to which no existing establishment corresponds, but which all may approximate, only however after an irenical and mutually supplemental plan. But the school of *Calixtus* flourished during but a brief period, comparatively. Presently the noble aspirations which the order fostered, were silenced amid the controversial din of Pietists and Rationalists. Thus were the two representatives of an historico-irenical tendency ignored and rendered odious, through the ultra-Protestant self-sufficiency of their cotemporaries; and only at this day may they again hope for a more favorable consideration, and share in a reassumption and further development.

Only during the Present and Future, we maintain, may we hope for it. Not even to the recently transpired period of *Illumination*, which pitched its tabernacle upon the ruins of the fallen temple of orthodoxy, could we concede the proper qualifications for a profound sifting of pregnant ecclesiastical problems, gentle and patient as was its manner, and still more so its tone, for it was necessary, first and foremost, that a truly historical world-view should break its way in direct opposition to an out-and-out unhistorical Rationalism, which, during its culmination, unmistakably walked hand-in-hand with the deepest decline in all knowledge of Christian antiquities. It was Rationalism precisely, that so perseveringly replaced, as a superannuated and worn-out relic of the Reformation-epoch, the *usus loquendi* touching the darkness of the Middle Ages; and it is this most largely which propagates the prejudice even to our own day, that darkness like night enveloped the nations through entire centuries, clean down to the thirty-first of October, Anno Domini 1517. Shearing Christianity of all positive elements and wresting all incidents in Revelation—what is this, in its last ground, but the coarsest opposition to every truly historical rendering of facts? For such a view is only possible after a most faithful recognition of facts and liberal conception of their concrete impressions. And let us not shut our eyes against the truth, that the antipathies of the Illuminati, as well as in those of the same mind during the present age, towards the Catholic Church, are in a large measure also antipathies cherished against everything that is of a primitive Christian order within her bosom. Catholicity has indeed occasioned these antipathies through its deterioration, inflexibility and indifference; yea, the most direful responsibility resting upon its head may, perhaps, lie in the fact, that Christianity itself was shorn of all power, in those very countries, in which the Reformation could not bring forth fruit, along with the Papacy and Jesuitism. Still, they are not excused who, on this account, array themselves against Catholicity at large, regardless of whatever Christian elements it embodies. And yet this has been an actual fact. As a later Church historian correctly remarks, the order of the Jesuits was, in fact, the earliest sacrifice to the spirit of the age, completely alienated from all religious affairs—notwithstanding the fact that its suppression became a moral necessity. What we mean, however, is, that at the bottom of this aversion to an unveiling of Catholicity, which is, besides, most generally accompanied by a deplorable ignorance, is found at hand, also, in all who assume such an attitude, a decided want of competency to concede to it its right and proper significance.

To such a position we can only attain through an insight into the world-*status* of Christianity, which the age of Illumination was not capable of entertaining. This late age is for us already, in a manner, historical, and in so far intelligible, as to serve us with some useful lessons. A theological Rationalism still continues to consume the legacy to which we have fallen heir from the earlier ages of faith. But this is a peculiarity in the *modus operandi* of Christianity, that it ceases not to leaven as a moral power in secret, even in the minds of those who refuse any longer to submit their thinking to its authority, and have either lost or eliminated its sacred mysteries from their consciences.

Though separated from the living fountain, the age of Rationalism still continued to enjoy incalculable benefits from its earlier issues, and remained a Christian age nevertheless, not indeed by virtue of, but in spite of its Illumination. There was still a reflection of the departed religious sun of a former age apparent, like the mild but feeble moon, in the good will and morality, in a reverence for God and Christ, on the part of many Rationalists—all of which argued an antecedent era of faith, in whose bosom their youth had fallen.

But a different order of things has set in. The secret power of Christianity which exerted its influence on practical thinking and morality, especially in the humbler walks of life, now vanishes at an alarming rate, even in Germany, only to open the way for a positive and deliberate denial of Christianity. The corresponding phenomena in the sphere of Protestant Theology are familiar to all. But the question is not so much, whether one or the other system of Protestant Theology or Philosophy has become more or less violently sundered from Christianity; in the rear of individual forces stands the phalanx of assenters, or the still more numerous mass of fickle spirits who, unanchored, are swept away by the current. The powers of darkness which belched forth with volcanic fury in the time of the French Revolution, are still lodged in the bosom of Humanity; they but slumber underneath the thin covering of mere conventional regulations. It is possible at any moment for a gulf of evil and infidelity to yawn in human society, excelling, in its terrors, all the omens of the present, and blasting every prospect and hope of peace.

Besides, there has already appeared in the theatre of the world's history a *third* power, though not as an incorporate Church, through which the entire relation and significance attaching to Catholicity and Protestantism has become radically changed. There is no more significant fact embodied in the interior evolution of Humanity than the development of Good and Evil—which is identical, at last, with Faith and Unbelief. Christ, the Invisible One, is still ever present and nigh; as He is during all ages the corner-stone upon whom His Church is built, so is He likewise the "stone of stumbling" for the latest ages, as of old. He is that Light which shineth into the night of universal history, that love or hatred may be enkindled by its rays; He walks amid the generations of men, though unseen by thousands, in order that their spirits may choose Good or Evil, accordingly as they may be affected towards Him.

Consequently no other position remains, in order to a true philosophy of universal history, than that which the antithesis between good and evil affords—light and darkness, faith and unbelief. And in proportion as universal history presses with irresistible energy for a clearer, more concrete and undisguised enunciation of the contradiction, all collateral questions will then become of relatively little weight, and whatever is sheer form will reveal itself more and more clearly through its dissolution.

Because of the mighty common foe that has risen, and in view of the impending struggle of universal import, the Protestant Christian of to-day should regard his Catholic brother with other feelings than were cherished in the past, and *vice versa.* This wholly altered relationship will likely also acquire a fixidity for itself, in the degree the presentiment becomes more decided, that all the civil and political appendages of Christianity must inevitably alter their character in the future.

The *Christian Commonwealth,* to which so many hopefully point us, let us candidly confess, has never yet become a consummated fact in history, even to this day; and never was the prospect for such a realization darker than at present. Withal, every striving in this direction is just and praiseworthy, provided we do not lose sight of the proper character of the Church or State. But whoever allows himself to be deceived in the actual condition of things, and conceives of the idea of a Christian Commonwealth as an existing reality already, thereby removes the goal all the further from himself. For, verily, every effort to enforce a Christian sentiment, by means of political and purely secular measures, will only alienate the public conscience of the age still more from Christian Truth.

Unless all the signs of the times deceive us, Religion must finally again become a matter of personal liberty exclusively, as it was in the beginning of Christian history. No doubt, the complete sundering of religion from politics will be attended with many complicated results touching the condition of the masses; but we fear it will assert itself with irresistible necessity, and we believe we may indulge the hope, that such an event will be attended with many happy results to the Christian Church. Or dare the Church not anticipate an extraordinary endowment of spiritual energy from on high, in case such a hazardous *status* of independence is attained as her present condition does not yet warrant? But if such a phenomenon should reveal itself in a fervor and quickening of Christian faith and life, not possible to be conceived of now, it will, at the same time, not fail to conduct the various Christian bodies which feel themselves to be homogeneously limited, into the path of mutual approximation and genuine fellowship.

Were but the divines in the Catholic Church once fully conscious, likewise, of the common interests at stake, over against the unchristian tendencies of the age! This too is one of the saddest features of modern days, that even the most marked minds in the circle of Catholic Theology come to regard us more and more, as well as contend against us, as of like nature and kind with those who lead the van in all the irreligious and Anti-Christian movements among us. They pervert the civilization of the age, in order to twist the positive denials of Christianity, manifesting themselves within the area of Protestantism, into organic and necessary connection with the principles and doctrines of the Reformers, the more readily to hurl their like anathemas against everything Protestant, be it Christian or unchristian in its nature.

But we should feel ourselves all the more earnestly challenged, on this account precisely, because of our larger freedom of thought and action, as well as more liberal view, to accord them the justice which they withhold from us, and instead of unworthily employing the advantages of modern science in behalf of a stale Polemics, to consecrate them in the service of a new-formed Theology of Reconciliation.

Thus Catholic Science of modern times will prove among the last factors of united forces, in rendering the solution of our problem all the more imperative a duty, since it too affords us the means to a definite answer.

They were the profound authors of our country, in the field of Protestant science, who first of all not only assigned to Catholicity its rightful merits, by virtue of a world-historic survey and truly humane conception of relative facts, but at the same time also prepared the way for a more elevated and ideal apprehension of the same, at a period, moreover, when its own sons regarded it with indifference. *Lessing* already cherishes presentiments of this order. *John von Müller*, our greatest historian, has rendered most efficient service towards the restoration of a truly historical estimation of Catholicity. They too had been of Protestant culture and training, who, like Count *Frederick Leopold von Stalberg*, who, after having entered its ranks, become in turn the most skillful defenders. Modern Catholic science owes its most efficient weapons to Protestantism. And far be it from our mind, in this account, to permit any indignation and jealousy to drive us to the opposite extreme, whenever we behold such characters, like *Frederick Hunter,* borne into the arms of the Roman Church, by virtue of a recognized world-historic view, when radically pursued. The Church of the future demands our service; and diligent loyalty, that will not suffer itself to be interfered with, in the prosecution of its clearly set task, by the failures of individuals, will and must result in good. In the eyes of such rigid Catholic authors as *Möhler* and *Görres*, all results of course, in a confirmation of Catholicity. We on the other hand, are called upon normally to apprehend and enforce a pure reality, such as actually exists as a significant testimony *against* empirical Catholicity. Hence, we are especially challenged, at this point, to realize for ourselves and others the constitution of the Primitive Catholic Church, as we find it portrayed in the writings of the Fathers, which like a mirror may reveal the defects in their establishment not only to us, but forsooth also to themselves.

It is one of the most encouraging signs of our prostrate Protestant theology, that, during the last half-century, principally through *Neander's* instigation and precedence, the study of Church History has advanced to such a degree, in extent, thoroughness and depth, had not been imagined by any one but ten years before. Indeed, his is, perhaps, amid all the activities of modern days, in the sphere of Literature, the most essential and favorable to our task. For, guided by the contents of the holy Scriptures of the New Dispensation, and apprehending them in a truly historical sense, the more thoroughly we enter upon the study of Christian Antiquity, the more nearly are we lifted to the peculiar *Niveau* of the Present, and occupy a position favorable for the verdict which all ecclesiastical questions demand.

If ever a day is to dawn for Protestant Theology and Science to pass under review the momentous ecclesiastical controversy, from the Reformation-era down to the Present, that day is now breaking. But the problem, after the form which it must necessarily assume for our age, will not be exhausted by a presentation which confines itself exclusively within the groove of so-called Symbolism, and, commencing with the Primitive state of man, proceeds to weigh over against each other, from *locus* to *locus*, the definitions of orthodox-confessional Articles. The task may not be performed by means of a dry comparison of contradictions, in their abstract forensic forms. After such a manner, precisely, may we, besides, expect the most important questions to remain out of view, *e. g.*, the Affirmation and Denial of the Right of Private Interpretation. The subject in its totality, as it exists and lives, must confront the mind. Many purely dogmatical points of controversy sink into insignificance, when viewed in detail at least. The weightiest and most efficient arguments for either party, during the present age, are not gathered on the fields of Scholastic Definitions and Punctilious Exegesis. They root themselves in the power of the idea and in history. The numberless varieties manifesting themselves in the Life of the Church, in Cultus, Discipline and Morals, in the Form of Goverment, in her relation to the State, and the consequent bearing in common life—*such* are some of the living questions embraced in the ecclesiastical controversy at its present *stadium.*

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE VATICAN DECREES IN THEIR BEARING ON CIVIL ALLEGIANCE. A POLITICAL EXPOSTULATION. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P. To which are added a History of the Vatican Council; together with the Latin and English Text of the Papal Syllabus and the Vatican Decrees. By the Rev. Philip Schaff, D. D., from his forthcoming "History of the Creeds of Christendom." Published by Harper and Brothers, New York, 1875.

The ample title of this comparatively small volume is at once an argument of its importance, and its best recommendation to the attention of the public. Our own sense of the world-historical significance of the Vatican Council, in connection with the Old Catholic movement in Germany, was presented at large in this REVIEW more than a year and a half ago. The subject since then has lost none of its importance; and the late Political Expostulation of Mr. Gladstone, it is well known, has had the effect of bringing it far and wide into new, exciting notice. All England has been moved by the challenge, and it is felt now as an awakening alarm throughout the civilized world. In some respects it betokens a deeper and more far-reaching agitation than that represented by Dr. Döllinger and his friends.

We make less account now of this Old Catholic movement, we must confess, than we were disposed to do two years since. It is not deep enough by any means for the exigencies of the age. It has shown itself altogether too ecclesiastical to be sufficiently theological for the life-questions with which the Christian world is now called to grapple. Dr. Döllinger's conference held last September, in Bonn, with all our admiration of the man, goes far of itself to show, in our opinion, how little is to be expected for any true restoration of Church unity or Church life, either in Germany or in the world at large, from the Old Catholic cause in general. It would seem to be in its best form, little more than the Anglican dream of a resuscitated Nicene Christianity over again. The movement, it has been well said, carries in it no grand actuating idea peculiar to itself. It lacks thus the power of inspiration and new creation; and in this respect it is not likely to form an epoch, properly so called, in the history of the world.

The issue involved in the Vatican decrees, as the course of things is steadily causing it more and more to appear, amounts to immeasurably more than any question of simple Church organization or of mere Church history. It regards the very being of the state, civil order, political obligations, the rights of humanity, free exercise of human thought, conscience and speech, the universal culture of morality, learning and science, no less than the universal order of religious faith, religious worship, and religious life. This of itself should serve to show the profound need into which the world has come at this time, through the progress, as it were, of its own life, and how much more is required, then, for the solution of its difficulties, than anything or everything that can be imagined in the way of mere outward ecclesiastical change. Nothing less than a living reconstruction of the whole idea of Christianity—issuing through the Holy Scriptures from the fountain-head of the Christian life and faith in Christ Himself—would appear now to be equal at all to any such object or end.

Dr. Schaff's volume is of course timely. It is a text-book of important literary material, which may be considered in some sense fundamental now, for the study of the complex controversy into which the universal energies of the age would seem to be drifting at this time, in one way or another, from all sides. In this view it deserves to be commended to public attention. It is interesting, also, in the character of a specimen of his "History of the Creeds of Christendom," a new forthcoming work, which may be expected to prove a new evidence and monument of the well-known indomitable literary industry of its distinguished author. N.

EPOCHS OF HISTORY.

EDITED BY EDWARD E. MORRIS, M. A.

THE CRUSADES. By George W. Cox, M. A., author of "History of Greece," "Mythology of the Aryan Nations," etc. With a map. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1874.

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR—1618–1648. By Samuel Rawson Gardiner, late student of Christ Church; author of "History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Disgrace of Justice Coke," and "Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage." New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1874.

THE ERA OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION. By Frederic Seebohm, author of "The Oxford Reformers, Colet, Erasmus, and Moore." With numerous maps. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1874.

These little volumes, of from 225 to 250 pages each, are a part of a historical library which the enterprising house of Scribner, Armstrong & Co. are publishing. In addition to those already out, the following are to be issued: "The Beginning of the Middle Ages;" "The Norman Kings and the Feudal System;" "The Early Plantagenets;" "Edward III.;" "The Houses of Lancaster and York;" "The Age of Elizabeth;" "The Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution;" "The Fall of the Stuarts;" "The Age of Anne;" "Frederick the Great and the Seven Years' War," and "The War of American Independence"—14 volumes, 16mo., cloth, uniform. Price, $1.25.

The object of this library is to bring a knowledge of the leading epochs of history before the reader in a small compass. The idea of selecting epochs is certainly a good one. These are the hinges on which the events of the ages turn. They afford an opportunity to look backward and forward. They include the most important events of history. They are of the most interesting character. When once the epochs are studied, the intervening periods can be studied with greater profit. To our mind it is a question whether our whole system of studying history ought not to be modeled on this principle. First let the leading events be studied in their relations, and then fill up with details.

These volumes bring history into a kind of epitome, adapted to the general reader. All have not the time and opportunity to study history in all its details. Yet they need a general knowledge of it. How shall they obtain this? A universal history is dry to read or study. The reader is not able to distinguish the more important from the less important. But here he has placed before him, so to speak, the cream of history. The reading of these volumes will beget a taste for more. Their contents are comprised in small compass, and yet they are fresh and entertaining, for they are not mere notes, nor compilations, but original productions.

Especially are they adapted to the young. What shall our children read? How many parents anxiously ask this question! The larger histories are too extensive and heavy. They require too much time. Hence the young seek something easier, and turn to the romance or novel. These may have their place, but they certainly should not crowd out historical reading. Such a library as this, each volume being brief and easily mastered, is just what should be put into their hands. We warmly recommend them for families and libraries for the young.

THE PARACLETE. An Essay on the Personality and Ministry of THE HOLY GHOST, with Some References to Current Discussions. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway. 1875.

This work is a contribution to the Apologetic literature of the present age. This literature is growing quite rapidly. The new attack on Christianity, starting in the Rationalism of the last two centuries, seems to be gathering up all its forces in this nineteenth century. The philosophical assault is now followed by the scientific; that is, from the standpoint of science. The centre of attack is the person of Christ, and the literature in defense here is very rich. No age has produced more works on the life of Christ, none has defended His supernatural character more vigorously. The attack is new, the apology must be new also. We mean not new absolutely. The attack brings forward much that is as old as Christianity, yea, as old as human speculation in reference to God and divine things. So the defence brings forward much that was used in the early Apology. Yet there is a difference. It cannot be otherwise, when we consider that Christianity is a new life, not a mere fixed system, and that human knowledge is progressive. The resources of the kingdom of light are more and more revealed, and the kingdom of darkness, making use of human progress and human knowledge, renews the assault in new forms.

The doctrine of the Holy Ghost, the *Paraclete,* is necessarily involved in the doctrine of the Person of Christ. As the effort is made to show that the idea of the incarnation of the Son of God is not foreign to the nature and wants of man, but rather called for by man's nature and destiny, so there is an attempt in this work to present the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in such a way as to show that it is in accord with man's highest reason and his deepest wants.

"The whole movement of history, in all that is vital and permanent, is a movement from the outward and visible to the inward and spiritual." So it was in the order of creation, which culminated in man, and so it is also in the order of salvation. The law and the letter were first, then the spirit. The subject of *inspiration* is then discussed, first as a doctrine, then as fact. This is followed by chapters on The Inspiration of Christ's Biography, The Holy Spirit as the Interpreter of Scripture, The Ministry of the Comforter. The Convictive Work of the Holy Ghost, Regeneration, Pentecost, The Witness of the Spirit, &c. Part second discusses: 1. The Collateral Spiritual Argument; 2. Materialism and Spiritualism, and 3. The Spiritual Organ.

The work seems to occupy orthodox ground, and reveals a good deal of strength in meeting the more recent arguments against Christianity. The subject is one which calls for discussion. As the doctrine of the Person of Christ has been attacked with great ingenuity, so the doctrine of the Holy Ghost will be assaulted likewise. It is important that the Church should be prepared for the contest.

ORIENTAL AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES. Second Series. The East and West; Religion and Mythology; Orthography and Phonology; Hindu Astronomy. By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Company, 1874.

Professor Whitney has written on Language, and the Study of Language, in twelve lectures, and on Oriental and Linguistic Studies, in a first series, comprising essays on The Veda, The Avesta, and The Science of Language. In this second series of essays he discusses the following subjects: 1. The British in India; 2. China and the Chinese; 3. China and the West; 4. Müller's Chips from a German Workshop; 5. Cox's Aryan Mythology; 6. Alford's Queen's English; 7. How shall we spell? 8. The Elements of English Pronunciation; 9. The Relation of Vowel and Consonant; 10. Bell's Visible Speech; 11. On the Accent on Sanskrit, and 12. On the Lunar Zodiac of India, Arabia, and China.

Professor Whitney is one of the first linguistic scholars in this country. His scholarship is of a university character. He treats his subjects with a thoroughness and grasp of thought that bespeak the finished scholar. He makes some telling points against Dean Alford's work on the Queen's English, but sometimes he appears to us more acute than profound.

The recent studies and investigations in the language, religion, and history of the East have invested that portion of the world with new interest. The works of Max Müller have accomplished much in this way. These studies will doubtless be turned to good account in the end in Christianizing those nations. A new era has already dawned upon China and Japan in the intercourse that has been opened up with them by the Western nations. Why they have so long resisted and rejected the Christian religion is difficult to explain. The Western people that originally wandered off from the plains of Asia seemed to be ripe for the reception of Christianity. Efforts were made in China and Japan—a commencement was made, promising good results, but the success was only transient. As Christianity is for all peoples and nations, we must hold that it is adapted to India and China as well as to Europe. Yet it has been cordially received by the latter, and persistently rejected by the former. The new insight into those oriental religions, Brahminism and Buddhism, only serves to show that they, too, have yearnings for the only true religion. For the great interest here concerned, as well as for the cause of science, we welcome these essays, and those of other writers in the same field, that seek to disseminate correct information in regard to the internal life and character of that portion of the world.

THE VOICE IN SPEAKING. Translated from the German of Emma Seiler, Member of the American Philosophical Society and Author of "The Voice in Singing." By W. H. Furness, D. D., Member of the American Philosophical Society. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1875.

This is a scientific work by one who has made the subject a careful study for a number of years. Madame Seiler studied in the best schools of music in Europe and became thoroughly prepared for her profession before she came to this country. She not only mastered the science of music, but learning by experience the mistakes made by teachers of vocal music, for want of a proper knowledge of the human throat, she applied herself diligently to the study of this wonderful organ, with the aid of some of the best anatomists and physiologists. The result of her investigations was a method of teaching vocal music which comprehends a proper use of the throat in singing. She has already established a reputation as one of the first teachers in this country, and she is winning additional fame every day through her carefully trained pupils. Her first work, "The Voice in Singing," has been widely and favorably noticed. In the preface of the present work she says: "I have frequently been applied to for information and instruction by teachers of elocution and by persons whose callings require them to speak in public. My attention has thus been turned to the action of the voice in speaking; and occasion has been afforded to me to pursue more thoroughly, with the assistance of my son, Dr. Carl Seiler, the study of the natural laws underlying these sounds. The results which we have arrived at are given in the first part of this little work."

The work here referred to considers, 1. Acoustics in General; 2. The Vowels; 3. The Consonants; 4. The Vocal Tones; 5. The Timbre of the Voice; 6. Reach of the Voice; 7. The Reflection of Sound; 8. Faults in Speaking; 9. Modulation; and an Appendix on Clergyman's Sore Throat, By Carl Seiler, M. D. This last chapter, though brief, explains the cause of sore throat in the case of many a public speaker. "The voice, rightly managed, may be used in speaking or singing all day long without any other consequence than a feeling of bodily fatigue." That is reasonable, and yet just the opposite result usually follows. If this is because of a wrong use of the throat, it is clear that it is of the greatest importance that all public speakers should know the fact.

This work by Madam Seiler, as we have said, is a scientific work. It is not designed to present a course of elocution. The ordinary reader may not be able himself, at least immediately, to put into practice the principles here laid down. But it is important he should know them, and then he may take further measures to put them into practice. Especially is it important that parents and teachers should have some knowledge of these principles. No man or woman should attempt to teach elocution who has not mastered the principles set forth in this book.

Madame Seiler is enthusiastically devoted to her profession. We hope the encouragement given to her will be commensurate with her thorough attainments.

THE HOUSES OF LANCASTER AND YORK. With the Conquest and Loss of France. By James Gairdner, Editor of "The Paston Letters," etc. With Five Maps. New York. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 1875.

We have just received this little volume, in addition to the others noticed, issued under the editorship of Edward E. Morris, M. A., and we have been so much pleased with it that we give it this additional and separate notice. The beautiful style in which it is published will at once recommend it. Then it is not large (about 260 pages). It can be read in a short time. The young reader will be able to see the end of his task. It presents a definite topic, and this can be studied here by itself. It is not a mere compilation. The author has consulted and studied the original sources. It considers interesting and important chapters in English history. Wycliffe and John of Gaunt, Wat Tyler's Rebellion, Owen Glendower's Rebellion, The Lollards, Joan of Arc, Jack Cade's Rebellion, The Council of Constance, Huss and Jerome, all these topics are treated. What has to be gathered out of a general history with a great deal of labor, is here presented as in a nutshell. This is just what parents want for their children. To cultivate a taste for history, to get the young to read *it*, and not so much fictitious literature—what parent does not wish that for his or her children? We believe, too, that parents will take the lead in reading these volumes. They form a little historical library of a most beautiful and excellent character. They may be had at Baer's Bookstore, Lancaster, Pa.

THE BOOK OF JOB. A Rhythmical version with introduction and Annotation. By Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL. D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. A COMMENTARY by Otto Zöckler, D. D., Professor of Theology at Greifswold. Translated from the German with Additions. By Prof. L. J. Evans, D. D., Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio. Together with a General Introduction to the Practical Books. By Philip Schaff. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway.

This is decidedly one of the most masterly and interesting volumes of this great work. There is a General Introduction to the Poetical Books of the Old Testament by Dr. Schaff, and an Introduction and Annotations by Prof. Tayler Lewis. These are both excellent productions. Dr. Lewis' Rhythmical version puts a new light on the Book of Job. Just as a beautiful painting may hang in a dull, dead light, and look like a common piece of art, but when a new light is thrown upon it the whole appearance is changed, and it now breathes a new life and spirit, so is this translation a new light falling upon the Book of Job.

This is one of the largest volumes of the series, containing over 600 pages, all treating this one book. We believe it will be read and studied with deep interest by all into whose hands it may come. This volume is to be had also at Baer's Bookstore, Lancaster, Pa.

SHADOWY HAND; OR LIFE STRUGGLES. A Story of Real Life. Published and sold by the author, Rev. Henry Morgan, Morgan Chapel, Boston. 1875.

Mr. Morgan is one of those eccentric characters who must not be judged, perhaps, by ordinary rules. The most unfavorable thing connected with his life is that he has published this book. Were it not for this we would be disposed to regard him with charity. All men are not born to do good in the same way, and Mr. Morgan might be useful in his way. But why publish such a book? That spoils it all. A man may do a great deal of good in the world in a quiet way, which might not stand criticism by ordinary rules; but when he publishes himself to the world and seeks notoriety, the spell is broken. Mr. Morgan's work may have some good results—the book is not worth the paper and ink with which it is published. But then, Mr. Morgan is not alone in making this mistake. Many other good men have made it. So even here our judgment must be seasoned with charity.

GIFT-BOOK FOR THE MILLION; OR LIFE-PICTURES OF "THE PRODIGAL SON." By Rev. D. Y. Heisler, A. M. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board. 1874.

A little late this book has come into our hands. We would have been pleased to notice it sooner, had the publishers placed it in our hands. It has become so well known through the Church now that we can hardly expect to help it any in that way.

It is of course not easy to say anything original on such a subject. The field has been traveled over by so many that nothing seems left for others to glean. Yet it must not be forgotten that the Scriptures are inexhaustible, and it is the heart that finds new treasure there more than the mind. Mr. Heisler treats his theme with ability in an intellectual point of view, but it is especially the glow of warmth thrown over it by his genial, kind and loving spirit that makes it pleasant to the reader. It is calculated to do much good. We sympathize with the criticism made by another in regard to the title. We would leave away the first portion and retain only the latter—"Life Pictures," &c. But this is only a matter of taste, concerning which we are not to dispute.

THE FAMILY ASSISTANT; or, Book of Prayers for the Use of Families. To which are added prayers for special occasions. By Samuel R. Fisher, D. D. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, 907 Arch street, and Smith, English & Co., 710 Arch street; ——— Cincinnati, Ohio: *Christian World* office, 178 Elm street.

We add our commendation also to the many favorable notices of this book. It meets a want that is felt by many. Its importance consists in this, that it is a true help for families and for private devotions. It is a guide for worship in these relations, and will no doubt accomplish much good.

TREASURY PICTURES; or, Readings for the Young in the Sunday-school and Family. Compiled by J. David Miller. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, 907 Arch street, 1875.

Many of the readers of the Child's Treasury will welcome these selections, put into permanent form in this little book. The selections seem to be made with care and good taste. The book is worthy of a place in Sunday-school libraries.

NOTE TO THE SUBSCRIBERS. With this number the MERCERSBURG REVIEW commences its *twenty-second year*. It has passed its minority and is of age, and can speak for itself. In one sense it has experienced what young men usually experience when arriving at the age of their majority—they must go out and face the world on their own responsibility. The Board of the Church felt itself unable longer to provide for its wants. For some years that Board had to do this in part at their own expense. Now the young man must earn his own board and clothing. Well, he has found a new and kind patron, and he proposes to make the effort. The printing will have to commend itself. It is done in an extensive and enterprising House in Lancaster, Pa. The editorial force is strengthened. We think the contents of the present number will be found to be fully up to the standard merit of the REVIEW. We hope to be able to add to its interest and variety in the future. To this end we shall endeavor, from time to time, to furnish articles of a literary, historical and scientific character, in addition to those that are strictly theological. In order to do this we would like to enlist the interest of the Alumni generally. There are among them those who can furnish able articles of the kind referred to. We hope they will come to our help, so that the REVIEW may represent not only the interest of theology, but of science and literature also. The type of thought, and the philosophy of the College, are worthy of being brought before the literary public. In the department of English literature, a professorship of which is now established in the College, we should have an essay occasionally.

In regard to the theological position of the REVIEW, we may say that it is expected to *move forward* in the same line of thought. It will be true to its *prospectus* in seeking to advance the interests of Christological, Historical and Positive Theology, and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature. It will continue to be Catholic, claiming a title to the theological treasures of all ages. It will stand on soundly Protestant ground, and give attention to the more special department of Reformed theology and German Church life.

But it does not propose to stand still. Mercersburg theology, if we understand it, does not seek so much to stand in a system fixed and finished (which would be dead and ought to be buried), but it seeks by the power of fundamental principles and ideas to work for true progress. It is not the same that it was a quarter of a century ago. It holds fast to the same general principles, but the application of these necessarily varies with the change of times.

In its earlier history it directed attention to the weaknesses and defects of Protestantism, and sought to revive an interest in the principles of Christianity as historical and churchly. It may have exposed itself to the charge of being somewhat one-sided and negative in this respect. Certainly the new attitude assumed by the Roman Church, in its proclamation of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility, has brought us face to face with the extremest pretensions of Ultramontanism. Whatever needs there may be in Protestantism, and no one will deny that it needs greater unity and authority, yet these are not by any means to be met by the external and arbitrary authority of Rome. But all the greater is the necessity for Protestantism to assert itself in the better elements of its life. It is awaking to this necessity, and is coming to stand together against the waves of infidelity on the one side, and Papalism on the other.

But the main principle that animates Mercersburg Theology is the account it makes of the person of Christ in the redemption and completion of our human life. In this it is in hearty sympathy with the best Protestant Theology of Germany. Since Schleiermacher, this principle has become central for theological thinking, and its strength has been tested and developed by the deadly onset against it by the Tübigen School—by such men as Strauss, and in France by Renan. The literature on the Life of Christ, and the person of Christ, has grown very rich. Here the battle now rages. We stand firmly on this ground—Christ the principle of Christianity, and of life in individual Christians.

And now we ask our friends to help in extending the circulation of the REVIEW. Let every subscriber endeavor to procure *one new* subscriber. If that is accomplished it will be placed upon a firm basis, and can go on its way rejoicing. As the expense of publishing the REVIEW must be met quarterly, beginning with the first number, it becomes a necessity that subscribers, so far as possible, pay their subscription in advance, and in all cases during the year.

The present number has been somewhat delayed on account of the change in its publication. In order to prevent still further delay, we have read all the proof here. If the contributors and readers should notice an occasional error, they are asked to excuse it. In future we will endeavor to send out proof to the writers as usual.

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1875.

ART. I.—PRINCETON AND ANDOVER ON CALVINISM.*

It is a curious fact that two articles have appeared simultaneously in the Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review and the Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Eclectic, at the opening of the present year, the one in support of the theory of the divine decrees commonly known as Calvinism, the other against that theory. This fact is curious, even though the article from Andover, which is a a translation, may not be intended at all to express the position of that theological centre on the subject under consideration. It appears in the Review without note or comment. It would hardly have been published in the Princeton Review under any circumstances. It is curious also that the article from Andover should come from *Rothe*. The great German theologians and philosophers of the more recent times have hitherto been tabooed by Puritan and Presbyterian teachers; they are still, no doubt, considered by Princeton as entirely out of the circle of orthodoxy, and entirely unreliable and positively dangerous. Rothe was a great thinker and a good man, and his worth in both respects has been amply testified to in two excellent articles by Dr. Samuel Osgood of New York, in the Bibliotheca Sacra of last year. Years ago, when Mercersburg called attention to the masterly writings of such men as Schleiermacher and Rothe, it was considered a reproach by New England to have anything to do with them, and suspicion was spread far and wide against the orthodoxy of the Reformed Church because the professors studied them. All this is changed now.

---

*Calvinism in Doctrine and Life. By Lyman H. Atwater. Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review. January, 1875.

Rothe on The Limitations of Divine Foreknowledge. By J. P. Lacroix, of the Wesleyan University, Ohio. Bibliotheca Sacra, and Theological Eclectic. January, 1875.

The article by Dr. Atwater is, no doubt, intended as a breakwater against the tide that is setting so powerfully in opposition to Calvinism, "not only by skeptics and rationalists, but by some evangelicals who so misconceive and misrepresent to themselves and others its" (Calvinism's) "peculiarities, as to give them a hideous aspect, &c." "Whoever avows this predestination," he says, "will earn for himself the title of Calvinist, and not unlikely, at the hands of some redoubtable polemic, the credit of making God an 'infinite gorilla.' An eloquent preacher, whose prayers lifted us to the third heaven as no other man's ever have, once told us, that whenever a minister preached election, he was sure to hear within a week that he had been preaching that 'hell was peopled with infants.' No question, it is a part of the strategy of most anti-Calvinistic writers now, to load Calvinism with the doctrine of infant perdition, which it discards,* and which has no more necessary affinity for it than for other systems. But what we specially note is that predestination is recognized as a differential element of Calvinism by friend and foe, and is usually believed by each to carry with it whatever else he understands, or misunderstands, to belong to the system."

---

*May there not be a reference here to Dr. Krauth's article, in which he showed so conclusively that Calvinistic writers in the past did teach the doctrine that non-elect infants, dying in infancy, are damned? Dr. Hodge had published the remark, with special reference to something Dr. Krauth had said on this subject, that he (Dr. H.) was not acquainted with a single Calvinistic author who taught this view. Dr. Krauth showed conclusively in his article (which afterwards grew into a small volume) that the Calvinistic writers so generally teach it, that it is difficult to find one who does not. Since then Dr. Hodge has made no attempt at a public reply, nor has he publicly recalled or corrected his assertion. It may, indeed, be said that Dr. Hodge has no interest in this merely historical fact. But it is important; because, if the great Calvinistic writers have held and taught it in the past, it is a question whether Dr. Hodge can claim to be a consistent Calvinist if he denies it. Dr. Atwater here sets it aside as a reproach. It would be more satisfactory if he were to show how the salvation of all infants who die in infancy can be reconciled with his doctrine of the divine decrees.

We propose to notice some of the arguments contained in this article of Dr. Atwater's, and also some of the counter-arguments contained in the article from Andover.

Dr. Atwater sets out by stating the doctrine of predestination by quoting from the Westminster Confession, "God from all eternity, did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." After a few quotations of this kind, he proceeds: "The objections and charges so vehemently urged against this doctrine, that it subverts or impairs the moral freedom and accountability of men, therefore, are utterly groundless." He then goes on to furnish what he regards as proof. We give the opening paragraph of his argument, and follow it by one on the other side, from the article in the Bibliotheca Sacra.

"The decree of God is effective if it ensure the simple *certainty* of the event in accordance with the true nature, and by the proper efficiency of its immediate cause; and so freely, if it be free cause. Such certainty of action in no manner impairs freedom in the manner of it. This is susceptible of easy demonstration. Is it not certain that the most perfect free agents, God, holy angels, and the spirits of the just made perfect in heaven, will never swerve from perfect holiness, and this without detriment to their freedom? And is not this certainty, that God will only do what is right and best, as absolute as both his goodness and freedom? Moreover, it is indisputable, may we not say self-evident, that the nature of any event, or the action of any cause, whether free or necessary, is not changed by the antecedent certainty that it will occur, and none the less so if this certainty reach back to the eternal cognitions and counsels of the infinite mind."

There are two points here. First, the certainty of actions in the case of God and those who have obtained a fixed, positive moral character. Then, that the action is not disturbed by a knowledge on the part of God that it will certainly take place. The whole argument here hinges on the foreknowledge of God. Let us see what *Rothe,* in the Bibliotheca Sacra, says on this point:

"A difficulty presents itself, however, so soon as we apply the idea of the divine world-government to the actions of personal world-creatures (*i. e.* within the sphere of our earthly-world, to human beings)—in view of the fact that the actions of personal beings, in the very nature of the case, proceed from personal self-determination. For as the divine world-government presupposes a world-plan, and as such a plan implies a divine predetermination of the world's development, it would seem, at first view, that thereby the personal free self-determination of personal world-creatures were inevitably precluded. Such a predetermination, in the sense usually implied, manifestly precludes the possibility of effectual personal will-determinations in such creatures; and the impossibility of such will-determinations involves the psychological impossibility of personal will-determinations on the whole, at least, for all such as know of such divine predetermination. For, indeed, who would, with a clear consciousness, be willing to make efforts which he knows to be utterly superfluous and ineffectual? Now, the traditional but obsolete make-shift at this point is this: that God's eternal foreseeing of the future free actions of personal creatures is called in to the rescue. God is represented as basing His own eternal world-plan upon His certain eternal foreknowledge* of all the future workings and activities of His (yet to be created) creatures, and more especially of the future free actions of such of them as are personal. By this course, however, the knot is not disentangled, but only rendered the more perplexing. For it not only does not enable us to safeguard creatural freedom, but it forces us, at the same time, to sacrifice also the freedom of God Himself, reducing Him to a dependence on His personal creatures, utterly inconsistent with His absoluteism. In the case of a being such as the personal creature, and especially in the case of man, before having attained to his moral perfection, the divine foreknowledge of his actions necessarily* precludes His freedom, so soon as we take this term in its full sense (that is, as the capability of choosing between contradictory forms of self-determination). For in such personal creatures freedom has not as yet become absolutely indentical with (moral) necessity (which it of course can become, and which it in fact is, in its true perfection, or as true freedom); in other words, its character has not ripened to its definitive perfection, and consequently there must inevitably as yet cling to its freedom some degree of capriciousness. Any pretended free-will act of such a creature, which can be foreseen with unconditional (and it is such alone that we here mean) certainty—even though the foreseeing one be God Himself—becomes, by this very condition, an unfree, necessary one. So long as my freedom is not as yet ripened beyond all caprice or subjective discretion, I am really free only when I can say, 'I could, just as I am, and as precisely this same person, have chosen and acted, in this particular case, also otherwise than as I have done, though of course not with the same ease, or as the case may be, difficulty.' If God infallibly foreknows with apodictic certainty, all the actions of men, then these actions must be absolutely certain beforehand; but (seeing that, as being partially discretionary, they cannot rest absolutely on inner necessity) they could be absolutely certain beforehand only through a divine predetermination; but this would not only preclude the free self-determinatien of man, but also make God the author of sin. That which in God's knowledge stands objectively fixed, cannot be for man, in his present unperfected state, a matter of free determination; the absolute foreknowledge on the part of God of the actions of as yet not perfected creatures is unavoidably a predetermining of the same.† It is in vain to seek to evade this consequence by resorting to the formula, that God foreknows the free actions of creatures expressly as free.* This formula contains a self-contradictory assertion ; for the free, in so far as it is as yet discretionarily (capriciously) free, can, as such, not possibly be foreknown in an absolute and infallible manner. It cannot at all be an object of a proper, that is, an unconditionally reliable foreknowledge, and consequently also not of the divine foreknowledge. Of course we do not mean that the free does not admit of any precalculation whatever. On the contrary, any intelligent judge can conjecture beforehand, of any given moral subject, the manner in which he will act under given circumstances, and that, too, with all the greater certainty, the more accurately, on the one hand, he knows both the subject and his evironment, and the more fully, on the other, the said subject has already approached the completion of his character-development. But so long as the subject has not attained to perfect completion, that is, to a perfectly ripened moral character, this calculation can never lead to anything but probabilities, greater or less ; but not to an infallibly correct result, and consequently not to one that is apodictically certain. And of this latter alone we are here speaking. Such an approximate precalculation of the free actions of personal creatures lies, of course, in the capacity of God, and indeed to the highest degree, so that for Him all possibility of deception as to the degree of the probability of such precalculation is precluded. And He undoubtedly puts this capacity into full application, both in the forming of His world-plan and in His world-governing ; this, however, does not amount to a properly so-called, that is, to an apodictic foreknowledge.

---

* "The expression 'foreknowledge of God,' is not at all a happy one, as it is very liable to misapprehension and misapplication. There is a foreknowledge of God in no other sense than in that of forethinking (*a priori* thinking), and relatively, of a foredetermining."

---

* "Weisse (Philos. Dogmat, i. p, 609) says: 'The affirmation of an unconditional foreknowledge of everything yet to come, notwithstanding that it is made with as much assurance as by Augustine himself (qui non est praescius omnium futurorum, non est utique Deus.—Civ. Dei. v. p. 9), is, say what one will, nothing else than positive and glaring determinism,—a determinism which precludes the freedom of God, when the affirmation is applied to the future acts of God, and which annuls creatural freedom, when applied to all the acts of creatures.'"

†"Martensen (Dogmat., p. 413): 'Whatever can be an object of an eternal foreknowledge, must be based in a law of eternal necessity.'"

"To the question, how indeed such a foreknowledge as to the future actions of creatures could be possible to God, no other answer has been found than a resort to the statement that the divine foreknowledge of the future is not of a calculating character, as with man, but is intuitive, and that it can be such for the reason that it is of an eternal, trans-temporal character. This answer, however, is entirely unsatisfactory; for the divine foreknowledge is of an intuitive beholding character only as being speculative. To say that it is not a calculated foreknowledge can only mean that the thinking whereby it is reached is not limited by a lapse of time. The difficulty remains, therefore, wholly unremoved; for, unquestionably, thought can foreknow with absolute certainty only the absolutely necessary. And it is equally inconclusive to say, that because the knowledge of God is eternal and trans-temporal, therefore an intuitive knowledge of the future is possible. For, if a trans-temporal knowledge is conceivable at all, it is so only as a knowing through pure, or speculative thinking. But if intuitive thinking is taken in such a sense as not to be a knowing through pure thinking, then any trans-temporal beholding or knowing is, to us, at least, a meaningless word.

---

* "Müller (Sünde, 3. Auf., p. 289) says : 'If, in using this formula, the idea of freedom is taken in real earnest,......then it does not solve the problem, but simply proposes it. For the real question is, in fact, this: Whether God can infallibly foresee the future actions of free creatures, or eternally foreknow them, without by that very circumstance making them necessary ?'

"We must, therefore, regard it as settled, that the as yet future actions of unperfected personal creatures cannot, in the very nature of the case, be the object of any infallible foreknowledge whatever. And for this reason it does not in the least detract from the absoluteness of God not to predicate of Him an absolutely certain foreknowledge of such actions.*

"Knowledge differs, necessarily, according to the degree of the difference of its objects. God knows, in virtue of His omniscience, only that which is *per se* a possible object of knowledge; just as, also, by virtue of His omnipotence He cannot do everything, but only that which in the nature of things is possible. Even as it is *per se* impossible to cause that that which has been shall not have been, etc., so is it *per se* impossible to know that which in the nature of the case cannot be known. This non-knowledge or non-ability is in no sense a defect or imperfection on the part of God, seeing that the pretended objects thereof do not belong to the possible objects of the divine omniscience and omnipotence. Such a foreknowledge as we here deny, would, in fact, on the contrary, introduce an untruthfulness into the knowledge of God. For truth is the agreement of a conception with its object. Whoever, therefore, conceives the as yet necessarily undetermined and not absolutely about-to-be, as definitely and absolutely about to be, his conception has no objective truth. In fact, the denial of the freedom of God is an unavoidable consequence of the hitherto prevailing attempt to solve the difficulty here in question by a resort to the doctrine of the divine omniscience. For, if God foreknows absolutely, definitely, from all eternity, absolutely everything, then this involves the necessary assumption that from all eternity absolutely everything stands fast in an absolutely objective manner, and is consequently absolutely necessary. And, notwithstanding that it may be said that it is through God himself that absolutely everything stands thus from all eternity absolutely fast, still this does not safeguard the freedom of God; it simply declares that God Himself has from all eternity subjected Himself to an unchangeable necessity—that He has Himself enthroned a *fatum* above Himself, and consequently has divested Himself of that which is an essential attribute of His own nature. The fact is, free natural actions can be known in no other manner than as simply posssible.

---

* "Im. H. Fichtie (Spekul. Theol. p. 644): 'So certainly as a change in the world really takes place, it must be valid also for God, and for His consciousness, in so far as He is the highest intelligence; that is, He must know the past as past, and the future as to come.'—Vatke (Menschl. Frieheit, p. 479): 'Did not the antithesis of past and future exist for God, He would not be capable of knowing temporal things correctly; that is, He would not be omniscient.'

" And it is as clear as the light of the day that the attempt to reconcile the eternal world-plan of God and the will-freedom of personal creatures by appealing to God's eternal, absolute foreknowledge of the free actions of such creatures, inevitably (however unintentionally) destroys the absolute independence of God. If we conceive of the freedom of personal creatures as really the capability of choosing among contraries, and if we conceive of God as determined in his forming of His world-plan by His foreknowledge of the manner in which they will choose, then we make the thinking and willing of God in laying this world-plan dependent on the (by nothing determined) discretionary choice of free creatures. According as we conceive of the choice of even a single free creature as in any single case deciding in this or in some other way, such choosing will condition an entirely different series of consequences, and hence occasion an entirely different course of world-history; and inasmuch as we, according as the world-course is different, must also conceive differently of the plan of the divine world-government (which cannot differ from the world-course), hence we manifestly make the plan of the world-government to be modified, thus or so, from eternity, by the free actions of creatures. This position is, in fact, taken in express words by the notorious formula whereby the attempt is made to safeguard the freedom of moral creatures by a resort to the divine πρόγνωσις and πρόθεσις: 'It is not because God has foreseen it that thou hast done this or that; but because God foresaw that thy free choice would decide for it, He has taken this thy action into His eternal counsel, and made it a part of His world-plan.' Now, this assumption really involves a total reversal of the relation of dependence between God and the creature.

"Thus the attempt at safeguarding the absoluteness of God against a merely imaginary danger actually results in sacrificing it altogether. And, in general, this attempt is based on a view of the relation of God to the world which would imply that God had reserved to himself, during the entire course of world-history, only the tedious *rôle* of an idle spectator.*

"The only possible reconciliation of the contradiction between the assumption of a predetermined divine world-plan and the presupposition of the freedom of the actions of personal creatures, affords, as we shall see, a perfect safeguard to the character of God. Now the actual removal of this contradiction can, of course, be effected only by relaxing somewhat from the strictness of the usual conception, either of creatural freedom, or of the divine foreknowledge. From creatural freedom, however, nothing can be given up without sacrificing it entirely; whereas, from the very nature of the case, and in the very interest of the idea of God itself, we are imperatively driven to make such a limitation of the foreknowledge of God as we have above indicated.

---

* "Martensen (Dogmat., p. 193), remarks that the view which excludes the conditional from the divine counsels, evinces itself thereby, 'as unhistorical, in that it makes of history a merely passive reflex of the divine will.' On p. 248 the same author writes: 'As an unconditional foreknowledge annuls the conception of the freely-acting creature, so also it destroys the conception of God as freely-acting in history. The God who foreknows everything becomes thereby a mere spectator of the already eternally-settled and predetermined events of history, and is not the all-tempering ruler in a drama of freedom which he carries out in co-operation (or in conflict) with the freedom of his creation. Hence, unless we wish to preclude the free mutual relation between God and the creation, we cannot regard the entire actual world-course as the contents of the divine foreknowledge, but only the eternal contents of the world-course, or the eternal truth developed therein.' On p. 224, he says: 'The antagonism which some have found between a free world-course whose ways are not God's ways and the absolute dependence of creation upon the divine omnipotence, rests upon an ignoring of the truth that omnipotence is essentially an ethical, and hence a self-limiting power.'"

"Moreover, the position we have here taken as to the divine world-plan and the divine world-government, is imperiously and directly called for by the very religious interest itself. For by the entertainment of any other view, the act of prayer becomes not only absurd but also a piece of thoughtlessness, which would be, religiously, entirely inexcusable. The pious consciousness in its direct and absolute certainty of the real effectualness of true and properly so-called prayer, will and must, despite any and all seemingly consequent theology, unhesitatingly reject as false any and every conception of the divine world-government which admits of no scope for prayer—that is, which precludes the possibility of a really determining influence on our part upon the will of God and upon his guidance of the world."

We have given Rothe's argument at length on this one point of the divine foreknowledge. Whether it is fully correct in itself or not, and whether it can be reconciled with facts and the teaching of Scripture or not, it fully answers the argument of Dr. Atwater, for his theory of the divine decrees, drawn from reason, that is, what he calls the *a priori* argument. It appears that both agree in rejecting that theory of the divine foreknowledge which makes it dependent on the actions of the creature. Dr. Atwater argues as strongly as *Rothe* that "divine foreordination underlies divine foreknowledge." We may add here that Rothe by no means denied the doctrine of predestination, but explained it as referring to God's world-plan. "This world-plan settles immutably the world-goal, as well as also the organic series of logically necessary stages and development crises through which the world can be brought to this goal."

In what he calls the *a posteriori* argument, Dr. Atwater brings forward several exemplary and crucial scriptural cases.

The first one is the selling of Joseph into Egyptian bondage by his brethren. This act was inspired by the foulest motives of fratricidal envy and hate, on account of Joseph's superior goodness and prospects of deserved preëminence over them. They acted with full freedom, there was no compulsion exercised over them, and yet the solution of the matter refers it all to God. "But as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass as it is this day, to save much people alive." "This sin" (of selling Joseph into Egypt) "God abhorred, but yet suffered *and purposed* its occurrence, not for the sake of the sin, but for the sake of the immeasurable good to which he could overrule it." Of course, when Dr. Atwater says that God not only suffered, but purposed the occurrence, he begs the question. We do not think the historical case, nor the explanation given of it in the words of Joseph, necessarily teaches any such purpose on the part of God as rendered the actions of the brothers a necessity. Joseph unquestionably was to be a savior in the family of Jacob, and thus a type of Christ, and this implied wickedness on the part of the brothers and suffering on his part, but all this can be explained as well by allowing a divine governing power on the part of God running through the whole plot, by which he was able to bring good out of evil. This is something different from the idea that God purposed the very acts of wickedness by which the conclusion or solution was reached. Besides, there is nothing in this historical case which teaches or even intimates that God predestinates any one to eternal condemnation, which is the mainly offensive feature in the modern Calvinistic theory of the divine decrees.

The second example is the crucifixion of our Lord, "the pivot on which human history, and the administration of Providence and Grace alike turn. In forms most manifold, Christ signified to us that this great tragedy was to be carried through according to the counsel and purpose of God, and never more than in the outburst, 'Not as I will, but as thou wilt.'" The whole course of Messianic prophecy points forward to it, and when it is accomplished, Peter explains it by saying, "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Again, "For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done."

But neither does this case make out the theory of divine determinism in the sense of the Calvinistic theology. It is not difficult to see that God determined, when man fell, that His Son should be his redeemer from sin and death, and that in this character He would suffer the death of the cross. All this lay, by internal necessity, in the idea of a redeemer. The world, as sinful, would oppose and seek to destroy a sinless one who came to do them good. And God certainly directed and governed the whole unfolding of His plan of redemption, through the chosen people, down to the death of Christ upon the cross. Such a plan could even include with certainty such minutiæ as the betrayal by one who had eaten bread with Christ, and the parting of His raiment by the soldiers, without, however, making the persons or the particular acts of those wicked men determined by a necessity external to themselves or the sinful world in which they stood. That, of course, is the only point in which Calvinism runs counter to the Christian consciousness—viz: Does God predestine any of his creatures to the commission of evil deeds, and through these to eternal condemnation? Even if we should allow (what we think cannot be shown) that the men who crucified Christ were predestinated to do it, yet all this would still not establish the doctrine of reprobation, for those very persons who were engaged in crucifying Christ had the offer of eternal salvation made to them. That is Peter's sermon. Ye, who by wicked hands have crucified and slain the Lord, are still invited to come and share in the salvation procured by His death.

After giving these two monumental examples, which the article in the Princeton Review regards as examples "of God's purpose and decree extending to, and making certain the coming to pass of acts of superlative guilt, which yet are inextricably interlinked with whatever is most fundamental in His kingdom of grace and glory," the writer proceeds to explain how "this doctrine logically includes the doctrine of election of the heirs of salvation, and of non-election, otherwise preterition, which is all that is meant by the somewhat sterner, though not unscriptural term, reprobation; election not to salvation without faith, holiness, and good works." The point here made is, that while God elects some to eternal life, He elects others to eternal death, but that he does this latter by passing them by, by non-election, or preterition, which is in itself the determination, and consists in God's withholding the saving and renewing operation of the Spirit from the sinner, as a judicial and penal visitation for his sins. And he fortifies this by referring to the assertions in Scripture that God often withdraws or withholds His Spirit, and other restraints on men, in punishment of their obduracy. That is undoubtedly true. But in all such cases the individual first hardens himself, and Scripture nowhere teaches that this original hardening of the heart is because God has necessitated it by withdrawing His Spirit and grace. On the other hand, St. Paul clearly declares in his epistle to the Romans that the heathen hardened themselves against God, that they would not retain the knowledge of God in their hearts, and *therefore* God gave them over to a reprobate mind. But this *preterition* theory just reverses this. It makes God's passing them by in the first instance, the cause of their inability to attain to salvation. And that in the face of many declarations of God to the contrary.

The writer seems to feel the force of this difficulty. He finds it necessary to grant "that God is perfectly sincere in all the gospel offers and promises, even in His condescending overtures and expostulations, beseeching men to be reconciled to Him, and to render Him reasonable service." He says, "there is a true sense in which God is 'not willing that any should perish, but would that all should come to repentance.' But," the writer goes on to say, "this is, of course, not His will of decree or purpose, that this latter should come to pass, whatever else it may be; otherwise it would contradict much that, as we have seen, God has elsewhere affirmed."

Just here it is that the writer reveals, as we think, a bias in favor of the Calvinistic theory of reprobation, which disqualifies him for properly interpreting the Scripture on this subject. Why, we may ask, does he make the Scripture, which treats of the divine decrees, the measure or rule by which we are to interpret other Scripture which presents the offer of salvation to all men? And why does he urge that we must hold on to his theory in regard to the former, whatever may become of the latter? The portions of Scripture which teach of the divine decrees are, on all hands, regarded as the more difficult portion of it. Even the straitest sect of Presbyterians acknowledge that they contain a doctrine which should be handled with the utmost care. May they not be just those to which St. Peter refers where he says that his brother Paul had uttered some things hard to be understood, and which some wrested to their own destruction? Why then should the more abstruse and more obscure here be made the norm by which to interpret the more plain and clear? God's love for man, His desire for their salvation, the provision made for all in Christ, all this lies upon the surface of Scripture from beginning to end. Now we will not say that the understanding of this side of Scripture must rule the other, which refers to election; but let each stand forth in its full authority for our faith, and let our theory be formed by accepting the demands of each.

That there is a universalism somewhere in the purpose of God for man's salvation, was felt in the earlier history of Protestantism, when Amiraud, of the school of Saumur in France, brought forward his theory that this decree had reference to man before the fall, while the particular decree originated after the fall,—infra-lapsarianism instead of supra-lapsarianism. The Bible clearly teaches that salvation is for man, and God chose man, or humanity *in Christ* before the foundation of the world. And according to this Christ took on Him the seed of man, and became a brother to all mankind, and the redemption He wrought out is as universal as the fall. This does not of course imply that all men will be saved. We know they will not be. But in seeking to find the reason why some are lost we are not to give the Scripture relating to this latter point precedence over that relating to the former. We are not to say, as Dr. Atwater does, this latter we must understand to refer to God's purpose and decree that some must be lost, whatever becomes of His disposition towards, and His provision for, mankind as a whole.

While we are on this point we may add that it was just such a false theory of election, as held by the Jews, that led St. Paul to write those mysterious passages in his epistle to the Romans bearing on this subject. They held that they were elected in such sense as to restrict the salvation which God promised. It was for them alone and not for the Gentiles, and in such sense too as to interfere with the freedom of God and overlook the sinfulness of the chosen people. We can hardly suppose that Paul would construct an argument against this false theory of predestination by showing that salvation is for Gentiles as well as Jews, and yet teach another theory of election which would set up other limits to the provision of salvation in Christ for all men. And so also it was just against this false theory of election in the minds of stubborn Jews that led Christ to speak on this subject when he said, "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him. All that the Father giveth me will come to me. Other sheep I have which are not of this fold," &c. In both cases the declarations are made against a false particularism and determinism attributed to God, and we should infer from this fact that we are to be cautious how we make any metaphysical theory now bear against God's universal provision of salvation for man.

Dr. Atwater and Rothe both appeal to the religious sense or consciousness of men to attest their theories. The former thinks every Christian is a Calvinist when on his knees. His prayers for God's grace to overcome the sinner, to convert him, for his own assurance of hope, or his present fruition of it, are based on the assumption, he thinks, that God does determine and fix all things relating to man's salvation immutably sure. There is some truth in this. Every Christian certainly must feel assured of his calling and election in order to have courage and faith in his prayers. He must believe that "He who has begun a good work in him will perform it unto the last day of Jesus Christ."

But now turn to what Rothe says in the closing words of the quotation from him, and see how he uses the argument just the other way. He says: "The position we have taken as to the divine world-plan and the divine world-government, is imperatively and directly called for by the very religious interest itself. For by the entertainment of any other view, the act of prayer becomes not only absurd but also a piece of thoughtlessness, which would be, religiously, entirely inexcusable. The pious consciousness in the direct and absolute certainty of the real effectualness of true and properly so-called prayer, will and must, despite any and all seemingly consequent theology, unhesitatingly reject as false any and every conception of the divine world-government which admits of no scope for prayer; that is, which precludes the possibility of a really determining influence on our part upon the will of God and upon the guidance of the world."

The appeal here clearly does not lie all in favor of Dr. Atwater's theory. If all things are foreordained and come to pass with what Rothe calls *apodictic* certainty, then why should men pray? It is point raised from another standpoint, that of the all-sufficiency of natural law, by Professor Tyndall and his school. Can prayer affect the certainty of events fixed by law, or change the purpose of God? The Calvinist replies that the conditions are pre-determined as well as the end. God has ordained the prayers of His people as the condition of what He has purposed to do. But this destroys the idea of the freedom of prayer. It would require us to hold that the assiduity in prayer, or its negligence on the part of the Church, is fixed and determined beforehand. Then if the work of grace in the salvation of men flags, if sinners are not converted and the Church extended, God must have ordained the condition for this, just as when the Church is fervent and persevering and importunate in prayer, He ordains this as the condition for reviving and extending the work of grace in the hearts of men. Dr. Atwater seems himself to have a sense of this when he speaks of the Divine decree for the salvation of the Christian, quoting the words, "he who has begun a good work in you will perform it unto the last day of Jesus Christ," he adds, "not, indeed, without watchfulness, prayer and other needful effort, but in and by the use of all appropriate means, lest he fail of the grace of God and come short of his salvation. This is saint's perseverance enough for the Calvinist. More he does not ask. Less, none can hold who feel assurance of their own final salvation." Enough has been said to show that the difficulty in regard to prayer here does not all lie on one side, and that Rothe's appeal to the religious interest, or the Christian consciousness, has force, as well as the appeal of Dr. Atwater.

The article in the Princeton Review we are here noticing, goes on in the next place to urge that the doctrine of Calvinism in regard to the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, and justification by His righteousness through faith, does not lead to antinomianism. Much that he urges here has force. If we are justified freely by grace, not for any righteousness that we have, but solely for the righteousness of Christ, made ours through faith, it does not follow that we will be indifferent in regard to the necessity of good works in our sanctification. But his criticism of the course Calvinism ran in the New

England theology, and the conclusion he draws from this, requires some notice.

The Edwardian theology ripened into fruit in Emmons, who taught that God is the direct author of all human actions, alike and after the same manner, the evil and the good. This was the extreme of Calvinism. It lay, we think, in Edwards' view of the will. This gave rise to a sort of preaching in which the whole subject-matter was the Divine decrees. If sinners were to be awakened, it was to be done by preaching, not the law, nor the love of God, but the decrees of God. If sinners were to be converted, it was by preaching, not Christ and His grace, but the decrees. "It was among the current phrases of the day, which even became the subject of grave theological discussion, that the true test of conversion was 'a willingness to be damned for the glory of God.'"

This called forth a reaction in the teaching of Dr. Taylor, called Taylorism, which led off, as we know, a controversy with Princeton, in which the whole subject of hyper-Calvinism was called to do battle for its defence. Princeton Calvinism has never since been taken to the heart of New England theology, but the controversy and its issues have passed away, and been swallowed up by new issues. We hear only the faint and dying echoes of it now and then as in the article we are noticing. New England has passed on to a new theology, or at least out of the old, for better or for worse. There is hardly a theology there at the present time, though there is much and vigorous theological thinking. The general breaking down of the old Calvinistic system, as it formerly was held and preached, may be the preparation for something higher and better.

But before we proceed to this point, we must notice first, and in order to it, the conclusion drawn by Dr. Atwater at this stage of his article. He says the difficulty was that, in the earlier times, the New England divines preached the decrees instead of Christ. "The one great remedy for the faults that necessitated this reaction was to have put Christ where the Divine decrees had been thrust into his proper place. Instead of this, the sinner's own ability was too much signalized there; he was directed too much to look at that as a source of relief, when his eyes should have been more directed to the Great Physician for the removal of his guilt, helplessness and pollution." To all which we heartily respond, amen.

He then adds: "We will only say that, if in all parts of the Church we could hear justification through the blood, and regeneration by the Spirit of Christ, proclaimed as the indispensable condition of salvation, with an earnestness and emphasis as if it were the battle-cry of a new reformation, we should have far brighter hopes of the immediate religious future, than from all more or less pronounced outgivings in Christology, soteriology and eschatology which betray more sympathy with Unitarians and Universalists, than with Luther, Calvin, Edwards, Paul, or Christ."

All this sounds very well; but does not what Dr. Atwater regards as sound Calvinistic theology commit just the mistake here complained of? Does it not make the abstract divine will the principle of salvation, instead of the divine-human person of Jesus Christ? And did he not write this leading article in the Princeton *Review* just to revive the interest in the doctrine of the divine decrees as held in the Calvinistic system, which interest appears now on all sides to be waning? Is not the recently published theology of Dr. Hodge, the leader of Presbyterian theology, made to revolve around just this idea of the divine decrees? Here is the trouble: if preaching is to centre in Christ, our theology must centre there also. Not even justification through the blood of Christ, nor regeneration by the spirit of Christ, as doctrines, may take the place of Christ Himself.

There is a way of preaching Christ which makes much of Him in sound, but very little in substance. If our salvation is sought in the abstract will or decree of God, and Christ then is regarded, not as its source, but only its instrumental cause, we may ring changes on the name of Christ while we are all the while depriving Him of His true honor. In this way the very preaching of the atonement itself, the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, and the imputation of His righteousness to the sinner, may in the end strip Christ of His chief glory. These may be presented in the way of a commercial transaction, by which God's justice is satisfied and man forgiven, in such way as to be repulsive to the true Christian spirit, and contradict the Word of God. And it is the Calvinistic system which is is so prone to do just this. When God is represented as standing over the race as an angry judge, demanding satisfaction for a broken law, and then Christ is brought forward as the victim who must suffer the penalty, even to the last drop of blood, before God will relent and be propitious to man; and when then, according to an eternal decree, this satisfaction is placed over to the account of a definite number of the race who are thus saved by a divine purpose, while the rest are left to perish eternally—this manner of preaching Christ it is that repels, and forces honest minds, as in the case we believe of Dr. Bushnell, for instance, to seek some other solution of the great problem of the atonement, in which love may be the central principle, and Christ may perform a more active and positive work, in union with the Father. We say not that there is no great truth in the satisfaction theory, as presented by Anselm, but we say that in modern Calvinistic theology it has been made to crowd out, too much, other and equally important features of the great doctrine of the atonement.

Take this doctrine of predestination, which is made to be the corner-stone in Princeton theology. Is it treated from the standpoint of the person of Christ, *in whom*, St. Paul tells us, God hath chosen us from the foundation of the world? By no means. It is from the standpoint of the abstract divine will. The decree is, in some way, before Christ and out of Christ. It is an abstract scheme in the divine mind, and then Christ is chosen as the instrument by which it is carried out. Now if Christ is to be central in preaching, He must be central in theology also, for it is in our theological seminaries that our young men who go forth as ambassadors of Christ receive their methods of preaching. That which is central for faith and salvation, must be also central for thinking in reference to the plan of redemption. To make the divine will, abstractly considered, the starting-point, is just as one-sided as to make the human will the starting-point, as is done in Arminianism. There is need for a sound *Christology* in constructing our theology, which will regard Christ, in His divine-human person, as the only and absolute revealer of God to man, the source of salvation, and the solution of all the problems pertaining to human history.

We are aware that a Christology may itself be put in the place of the ever-living Christ. There is no saving power in a sound theology, and there is a deeper need amidst the confusion and distraction, the agonizing birth-throes of the Church in the present day, than any system of theology. What is needed most is active living faith, not in the doctrine, but in the living person of Christ. But theology and doctrine here, as always, have their place and their office. Faith and doctrine are necessary, the one to the other, and the theology that will stand amidst the trials and sifting to which the Church is now being subjected, must find its starting point, its centre, and its end in the person of Jesus Christ, who is the author and source of our whole salvation, in whom the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily.

But our space requires us to bring these remarks to a close. Our object has been mainly to call attention to the manner of treatment of a salient point of Calvinism in two of the leading theological Reviews of this country, the one from Andover, the other from Princeton. We do not believe Dr. Atwater's able and moderate article will be able to call back even the Presbyterian Church to its former interest and zeal in the Calvinistic theory of predestination. As in reference to other important problems in theology, so in reference to this; the age requires a new treatment, and from a different stand-point than that of the Calvinistic theology. That theology has features, in common with old Augustinianism, from which it draws its main inspiration, which will last while truth endures, and to conserve, not to destroy these, we need to look at the whole subject from another and better point of view.

We have presented the extended extracts from a not very smooth translation of Rothe, taken from the Bibliotheca Sacra, not to endorse them, but to show what difficulties the Calvinistic theory of predestination presented to one who was quite as far removed from Arminianism as Calvin himself, and who, for child-like piety and power of thought, can stand alongside of John Calvin himself, —the celebrated and now lamented Richard Rothe.

T. G. A.

ART. II.—THE HISTORIC CHRIST.

BY PROF. THOS. C. PORTER, D. D.

THERE are two genealogies of our Lord contained in the New Testament—one in the first chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, the other in the third chapter of the Gospel of Luke. Both were, no doubt, copied from carefully preserved registers existing at the time in the national archives at Jerusalem. The first begins with Abraham, and traces, from King David down, the line of royal succession. This is plain from the fact that of Jechonias, who died childless, it is said he *begat* his uncle Salathiel, which word, "begat" can only be understood in a technical or legal sense. The second traces the line of natural descent up to David, and beyond him to Adam. Each pedigree supplements the other and furnishes necessary links in the chain. Both end in Joseph. The conjecture of some Protestant expositors that the line of St. Luke ends in Mary and not in Joseph, based on the assumption that his name, as the reputed husband, was put for hers, according to Jewish custom, is not sustained by evidence. In either case, the rightful claim of Christ to the throne of his father David seems to require that he should be the only son of Mary. Being Joseph's first cousin, as is probable, as well as his wife, her son would become the true heir only in default of other male children. Between the two genealogies there are many apparent discrepancies, which have occasioned no little discussion amongst commentators and called forth attacks from hostile critics. To show how they can be harmonized is not the design of the present essay. It is enough to state that a satisfactory reconcilement may be found in an excellent article from the pen of Archdeacon Hervey, in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

Taking for granted, then, that we have in them veritable and faithful records, let us endeavor to deduce some of the lessons they teach concerning the human side of our Lord's person.

Viewed simply as a man, as the son of Mary, he stands fully within the sphere of the natural. His birth is surrounded by no mythical halo, such as invests that of the fabulous deities, demigods and heroes of antiquity. It occurred in no sequestered nook or cave among the mountain-solitudes, on no desert shore far from the haunts of men, but in a spot most public and open, in a crowded city, under the curious eyes of a multitude of witnesses, and in an age when the annals of history, free from the nimbus of remoter periods, are illuminated by clear light. In the classic pages of Greece and Rome we read of Venus rising from the foam of the sea, Minerva springing full-armed from the head of Jupiter, Hercules strangling serpents whilst yet an infant in the cradle, Romulus and Remus sucking a she-wolf; and even where such legendary marvels are wanting, the supposed origin of the incarnate divinities of the heathen is involved in an obscurity altogether beyond the range of the actual. They confront us rather as poetic personifications of principles, ideas and qualities than as tangible existences. The total absence of myth and magic in the accounts which the Evangelists give of the Babe of Bethlehem is, therefore, wonderful. The presence of the supernatural is, indeed, acknowledged, but it does not destroy, contradict, or in the least degree overshadow the natural, nor for a moment shake our faith in the fact that he was truly born "flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone." All the immediate incidents related bear on their face the unmistakable marks of verity: the taxation of the Roman Government; the coming up of Joseph and Mary from Galilee to their own city to be taxed (she great with child); the occupation of all places of accommodation by the crowds of people; the taking refuge in a stable under the pressure of poverty and need; the delivery; the putting on of the swaddling-bands and the laying of the babe in a manger. How graphic! How real in every particular! How touching and how beautifully human also is the filling up of the picture in this passage, translated by Coleridge from a metrical paraphrase of the Gospels, by the German Ottfried (A. D. 776–856.)!

"She bared with joy her virgin breast,
She hid it not, she bared the breast,

That suckled the divinest Babe.
Blessed, blessed were the breasts,
Which the infant Saviour kissed;
And blessed, blessed was the mother,
Who wrapped his limbs with swaddling clothes,
Singing placed him on her lap,
Hung o'er him with looks of love
And soothed him with a lulling motion.
Blessed, for she sheltered him
From the damp and chilling air.
Blessed, blessed, for she lay
With such a babe in one blest bed,
Close as babes and mothers lie.
Blessed, blessed evermore.
With her virgin lips she kissed,
With her arms and to her breast,
She embraced the Babe divine,
The Babe divine the virgin mother.
There lives not on this ring of earth
A mortal who can sing her praise.
Mighty mother, virgin pure,
In the darkness of the night,
For us she bore the heavenly Lord."

No infidel has ever seriously ventured to call in question the true humanity of Christ. The testimony, both sacred and profane, is too full, minute, circumstantial and concurrent to afford any ground for challenge on that point. He cannot be remanded into the realm of fable. Although His divine character has been denied again and again, either in whole or in part, and attempts made to eliminate or explain away everything supernatural in the Gospel records, the *man* always survives; shorn, it is true, of His celestial glory, but still such that His equal cannot be found among all the tribes of earth, or in all the volumes of fictitious story. The enemies of *the God* are compelled to do homage to *the man.* The confession of the French free-thinker, Rousseau, is well-known and often quoted. To this may now be added that of the English rationalist, the late John Stuart Mill. At the close of his posthumous work on Theism, he says: "It is Christ, rather than God, whom Christianity has held up to believers as the pattern of perfection to humanity. It is the God incarnate more than the God of the Jews or of nature, who, being idealized, has taken so great and salutary hold on the modern mind. And whatever may be taken away from us by rational criticism, Christ is still left: a unique figure, not more unlike all His precursors than all His followers, even those who had the direct benefit of His personal teaching. It is of no use to say that Christ as exhibited in the Gospel is not historical, or that we know not how much of what is admirable has been superadded by the tradition of His followers. The tradition of followers suffices to insert any number of marvels, and may have inserted all the miracles which He is reputed to have wrought. But who among His disciples or among their proselytes was capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or of imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels?"—and again—"About the life and sayings of Jesus there is a stamp of originality, combined with profundity of insight, which must place the Prophet of Nazareth in the very first rank, among the men of sublime genius, of whom our species can boast."

A real man, then, He is—the Man of men! But the human Christ does not enter the arena of our earthly existence as a stranger from another and a different sphere, in a body assumed for a temporary purpose—a sudden and transient apparition, like that of the angels of the Old Economy; nor does He appear as a fresh and independent creation, *sui generis*, separate and apart from the system of nature, but as the genuine product of preceding generations, flowing from the primal fountain of the race. He is "the seed of the woman," the highest and final outcome of a vast combination of powers and forces in nature, acting all along the ages before, not only through the generations of mankind, but beyond them and behind them, from the very foundation of the world. Upon Him the ends of that world rest, and hence we rightly count our years backward and forward from the hour of His birth. "For him *are* (and that includes *were*) all things, and by Him:" "*by* Him," as their divine Creator—"*for* Him," not as their proprietor merely, or to show forth His praise, but because they were brought into being in order that He might be. And this may be the right meaning of St. Paul's words, "He is the first-born of every creature." His own declaration, "I am the Root and the Offspring of David," is a strange paradox, but both sides of it are equally true; and of like significance is that more comprehensive one, "I am Alpha and Omega,"—Alpha, the creative source; Omega, the flower and crown of all created natural life. In this double sense He is also emphatically *the* Life of the world.

The study of nature is the pride and boast of our modern era.

Every region of her wide domain is explored with untiring energy and zeal. Facts and phenomena in vast numbers have been observed and collected; and these, sifted, compared, weighed and interpreted, constitute a revelation of surpassing interest. Geology, aided by the allied sciences, starting with the dawn of the earth's history, proves the gradual and successive growth of the continents, and, *pari passu*, the rise of organic life and the course of its development from the lowest and simplest forms and types up to the most perfect and complete. Chaos and chance give way to order and design. Among the physical forces there is an unbroken continuity of operation in obedience to law; an unbroken continuity of life also, explain it as we may. Evolution of some kind must be admitted. That which succeeds is either derived from that which goes before, or is rendered possible only by it. This seems to be God's mode of working both in nature and in human history as far as it belongs to the system of nature. Even where the keen eye of science fails to detect the necessary, hidden connections which bind all things together, that they certainly do exist is the profound conviction of enlightened reason. The unfolding of the mighty drama progresses slowly step by step, until, at length, it reaches its culmination in man, who is thus included in it and subject to its laws. But *man* is not a single person, a solitary unit. He flows out into space and time in countless generations, which waste away and perish as other living creatures do, and as the mammoths and the saurians did in by-gone ages, and like them is probably doomed to extinction. And is this all? The disciple of materialism, who confines his vision to the mere circle of nature, cherishes the notion that spirit and force are convertible terms, and barely admits the possible existence of a great, unknowable First Cause, will answer "Yes! This is the end of the chapter." But a deep logical intuition, fortified by all the analogies of the past and present, declares that, if this be so, if death and oblivion are to gain an ultimate triumph and reduce the globe to its original state of air, water and rock, the magnificent drama of organic life is a melancholy and ignominious failure, a delusive mockery, and demands that the tree of the human race should produce somewhere on its manifold branches "a bright, consummate flower" and precious fruit, which should be at once the quintessence of the old and the starting-point of a new and higher order of existence. Where, then, among the numerous kindreds and tribes of the race, its millions of individuals living, dead, or yet to be, scattered over the varied zones of earth and centuries of time, shall we look for such last and highest expression of humanity, such a gathering up of all its best elements, physical, mental and moral, into one perfect whole, if it be not found in the man, Christ Jesus? In Him alone the idea has become a concrete reality, and that it is so is supported by the most reliable evidence.

On account of their bearing upon this point, the genealogies of the New Testament possess great value. They are unique. No monuments of the kind have been discovered elsewhere. They indicate the central channel of the central stream of human history from its fountain-head, and furnish the true key to unlock its meaning. The record as it stands in the Scriptures of the Old Testament is simply an expanded chronicle of facts and events that bear upon the main issue. The nation which plays the chief part in the work of preparation is the subject of special tutelage and discipline, under the operation of agencies both natural and supernatural, and is thus gradually moulded and elevated, so as to render it capable of becoming, in the end, the parent of Him who was to be born "in the fulness of time." Divine purpose and plan, divine direction, inspiration, prophecy, miraculous interposition, are, indeed, manifest, yet do not cause the least disturbance or change in the character of the generative force which flows onward to its supreme result in full harmony with the common laws of our natural life.

Some of the principal facts and events in the history of the ancient Hebrews, in their relation to this supreme result, may be briefly noted. And, first of all, ample time was allowed for development. Abram, himself a noble scion of the leading branch of Noah's descendants, and hence of no mean and degraded stock, is called from Ur of the Chaldees no less than 2000 years before the advent of our Lord. The remarkable promise is made to him, that in his seed, not "seeds," as the Apostle tells us, "as of many, but of one, that is Christ"—all the families of the earth should be blessed, and, in this regard, the rite of circumcision, as the seal of the Covenant, is clothed with peculiar significance. During the four hundred years in Egypt, his few grandsons multiply into a nation, not in the state of abject servitude often supposed, but in contact with an advanced civilization, through which Moses acquires, at the court of Pharaoh, the special training that fitted him for the performance of the mighty work destined to exercise such a powerful influence over the future of Israel.

After the return to the land of Canaan, the nation is isolated from the rest of the world by two circumstances—the geographical position of the country and its political and religious institutions—no doubt, with express design, in order to exclude, on the one hand, any admixture of foreign blood, and to intensify, on the other, the effect of the Mosaic laws. Of all the countries in both hemispheres, none was so well adapted to secure the end in view. Although separated from neighboring kingdoms and empires by lofty mountains on the north, broad, sandy deserts on the east and south, and by the Mediterranean Sea on the west, it lay in the midst, and yet not too distant from, the great centres of heathen civilization, so that, when the King of kings should come, and the other barriers of partition be broken down, he might "go forth conquering and to conquer." Cursed and sterile as it now is, in the olden time it was "a land flowing with milk and honey." Situated in the middle belt between the icy north, where life is little else than a prolonged and desperate struggle for food and warmth, and the torrid south, where heat is in excess and the earth, of her own accord, brings forth her too abundant stores, verging toward the southern border of the North Temperate Zone, and thus within the latitudes where man has always attained his highest vigor of body and of mind, it possessed everything requisite for the physical well-being of the Hebrew people.

On such a people, and in such a land, the laws of Moses are brought to bear with full effect. And who can measure the influence exerted by these laws in their observance, even though partial and incomplete, through the ages that follow? Their discipline, severe, exacting and burdensome in many respects, displays a wisdom worthy of their divine Author, and could not fail to elevate the Hebrew to a level far above that of the surrounding nations. No better statutes were ever devised to promote a strong and healthly physical development. We need only to point to the high and honorable place assigned to marriage, the stern penalties awarded to adultery and fornication, the enactments for strengthening family ties, the numerous washings and purifications enjoined, the prohibition of injurious kinds of animal food, the equitable division and distribution of the land, the discouragement of commerce which creates overgrown wealth and engenders luxury, and lastly, the careful protection of the rights and freedom of the individual.

But the great distinctive moulding power proceeded from the worship of Jehovah, the Most High God of Israel, before whom "all the gods of the nations are idols and vanity." It formed the soul and centre of the entire system, and its rites and ceremonies are prescribed in elaborate detail. To this centre the ancient Hebrew looked with unwavering devotion and profound reverence, and in this school, received that intellectual, æsthetic and religious culture, which gave him, in the course of time, a just title to the foremost place amongst the children of Adam.

Whoever studies the Scriptures of the Old Testament with open eye cannot fail to observe the importance everywhere ascribed to hereditary transmission. The Mosiac laws were designed to suppress evil qualities and strengthen and perpetuate the good. And, whenever the latter appear in unusual number and excellence in prophet, priest or king, he becomes, in so far, a type of the expected Messiah. It must not be forgotten, too, that the Hebrews were a nation, in the strictest sense of the word—one family descended from one common father. Each tribe, moreover, pursued its own path of development and retained in no small degree the salient traits which distinguished its patriarchal sire. So intense and vigorous did their nationality become, in its isolation and under its peculiar regimen, that, even now, after the lapse of so many centuries and the widest dispersions, the blood of the Jew refuses to mingle freely with that of other nearly-allied peoples, with whom he holds the closest intercourse and of whose civilization he is a full partaker. A standing wonder of the world, it flows on, a separate stream in the general current, as the Arve, descending from the high Alps, is said to do in the midst of the more sluggish Rhone. The mighty power of hereditary transmission is more and more confirmed by the researches of modern science, and treatises have been written to show how it can be wisely modified and directed so as to produce the grandest results. Left to its own operation, under the malign influence of sin, its tendency is only downward to debasement and destruction. It is plain, therefore, that the genesis of the human Christ could not possibly occur in a degraded offshoot of the race, like that of the Hottentots or the cannibals of the Fejee Islands, or even in many of those which occupy a far higher rank in the scale of nations.

As the supreme birth, then, both of nature and of history, the man Christ Jesus, issues from a chosen stock, springing not from one of its remote and humble branches, but from a royal virgin, who could trace her descent in a direct line to a king like David, and, beyond him, to Judah, the flower of Jacob's sons; for, being his cousin, she had the same lineage as Joseph, her reputed husband. From such an ancestry, Mary, no doubt, inherited the noblest qualities of body and of mind, improved and purified by the discipline of ages. Her lowly condition in life formed no bar to their transmission, is no proof of their declining vigor. That glorious hymn which rose from her lips, in tone so subdued and yet so lofty, is a striking testimony in her behalf. Like water filtered through long, subterranean courses, it gushes forth in crystal purity and reveals the character of its source. In beauty, in lyric power and in depth of meaning, it falls no whit behind any of the psalms of David, the song of Deborah or the triumphal chant of Miriam; while, as the conscious expression of the sum and fulfillment of the Abrahamic Covenant, it surpasses them all. From such a mother came the human nature of our Lord; a mother whom all generations are bound to call blessed, and can safely do so without the bestowment of more honor than is justly due, or any disposition to magnify her into an object of fond idolatry.

Thus it is evident that the realness of Christ's humanity rests on a sure historic basis; but his full greatness as a man, who can comprehend? Our knowledge of him is derived chiefly from the Four Gospels. And yet, the Gospels, much as they contain, do not profess to give a complete picture of his earthly life. All that is essential is there, but how different the impression which even that makes upon the minds of men! The image, as it comes to us, is too often dimmed, dwarfed and distorted by our prejudices and our ignorance. Instead, therefore, of being less than the record, as rationalistic philosphers presume to imagine, there is reason to believe that he is far more.

"Anointed with the oil of gladness above his *fellows*," the kings and great ones of mankind, the Son of Man shows His marked superiority in two respects. First; He is sinless and immaculate, "without spot or blemish, or any such thing." The keenest hostile scrutiny has failed to discover the least stain or moral defect in His matchless character. And this is the more remarkable, when we consider the rare and scrupulous fidelity with which the Sacred Writers disclose the errors, faults and deeds of shame, which modern hero-worship strives to soften or conceal. Second; all the human virtues and excellences, which are scattered and exhibited in an eminent degree, only singly and apart, now in this one and now in that one, combine in Him, a perfect, rounded and symmetric whole, so that He transcends the limits of His Hebrew descent and fills out the full proportions of the ideal man of the race. Our two-fold nature as represented in the sexes is also there. He who reads aright will find in Him the strong will of the man associated with the most delicate and tender sensibilities of the woman. For the true ideal of woman we need not look to Mary. All the mother is in the son. It is woman's voice that speaks in His sad and touching lament: "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that stonest the prophets, and killest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy *children* together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, but ye would not."

In regard to His personal appearance—His shape, His stature, His gait, His looks, His gestures, His complexion, His temperament, the tones of His voice, and other particulars of the kind—the Evangelists are almost silent. No picture, bust or statue has been handed down to succeeding ages, to enable us to conceive, in some measure, what manner of man He was—and that, no doubt, for good reason. But, when we remember that His descent was most royal, that He was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and that in the same body in which He walked the earth, suffered on the cross and rose from the dead, He shall be visible to the myraids of the redeemed forever, we cannot suppose in Him anything less than the greatest perfection of which the human form is capable. The actual beholding of the King in His beauty is reserved for a higher world. As we walk by faith here, an imperfect corporeal similitude might prove rather a hindrance than a help.

It is a serious error to ignore or undervalue the human nature of our Lord. The opinion is sometimes entertained that He became incarnate mainly in order to have a body to offer up as a sacrifice for sin, and that, in other respects, little account is to be made of His humanity. But, it would be easy to show how disparagement of the man will, of necessity, weaken and undermine faith in the God. Indeed, our knowledge of the human side of His nature must have precedence in the order of time, just as it had in the experience of the disciples of old, who first learned to know Him as true man, and love Him as true man, before they learned to know Him as true God, and love Him as true God. Only by degrees did the revelation of the higher nature dawn upon them, until, at length, it reached clear consciousness in the grand confession of Peter, in answer to the question: "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?"

In the "Word made flesh," the divine does not overwhelm, absorb, or in any way interfere with the human, on the one side, nor does the human lessen or limit the divine, on the other. It is not a case of *possession*, but of *union*—union, real, indivisible, everlasting—the natures two and distinct, the person one—a holy mystery, which the Church has, in all ages, maintained with jealous care, believed with reverent and implicit faith and cherished as the very ark of her salvation.

An examination of the leading religions of the heathen world will set in stronger light the relation of the two natures in Christ's person. In the East, the Hindoos boast of a trinity of supreme deities; Brahma, the creator; Vishnu, the preserver; and Siva, the destroyer. To the second of these, Vishnu, are inscribed numerous incarnations, or avatars, for the benefit or relief of mankind, most of them in human form, but one of them in the likeness of a fish and another in that of a tortoise. Here we see a vain endeavor to solve the great problem, which met its true and final solution in Him, who is "the Desire of all nations." The divine is brought down from above and becomes incarnate, but the conception is only that of *possession, temporary possession*, for a specific purpose. The incarnations are not stable. They follow each other in long succession, for the man or the animal (and it matters not which) is a simple organ or instrument of the god, used for a brief while and then abandoned. What a world-wide difference between such an avatar and "the Word made flesh!" But more than this: none of these avatars have the remotest connection with the actual historic life of the race, and hence they belong wholly to the realm of the fabulous.

In the West, the Greeks and Romans and the nations of Northern Europe sought a solution of the problem from the opposite side—by exalting the human at the expense of the divine. Their gods, goddesses, demigods and heroes, are nothing more than men and women with enlarged powers—copies in which even the vices are not always omitted. Sex and natural generation are also transferred. The greatest of them, Zeus or Odin, is limited and circumscribed in his sphere of action. Mere personifications of the varied forces of nature or of human history, their worship was in substance only a worship of these forces. Not one of them can show any actual connection with the historic life of the race, and hence, like the avatars of Vishnu, they belong wholly to the realm of the fabulous.

The best mythologies of the heathen should not be regarded, as they often are, as pure inventions of the devil, in order to delude mankind. They contain much that is beautiful and true. But above all, they express the deep yearning desire of the Gentile nations after "the unknown God," and bear witness to the need of just such a Saviour as Christ the Lord, at whose coming they vanish like stars before "the king of day." "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." A prophet standing beside the new-born Babe, as he lay in the manger at Bethlehem, might have addressed the fairest luminaries of their bright galaxy in these words:

"Ye meaner beauties of the night,
That poorly satisfy our eyes,
More by your numbers than your light,
Ye common people of the skies,
What are ye, when the Sun shall rise?"

The effect which that rising did produce upon them is well described in Milton's celebrated "Hymn on the Nativity," in reading which we feel that the imagination of the poet has not exaggerated the sober truth of history. The old gods of Egypt, Syria, Greece, Rome and Scandinavia, have all vanished before "the dreaded Infant's hand.". Their power is clean gone. They only survive to adorn and beautify the pages of literature, and the names of those of our Saxon forefathers preserved in the days of the week may be allowed to stand without fear of awakening in any bosom the slightest disposition to idolatrous worship. They all have vanished: but the historic Christ, the Son of Man as well as the Son of the living God, still lives and reigns, secure upon His throne, and will so continue to live and reign, with ever-increasing dominion, "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever."

ART. III.—PASTOR FLIEDNER AND THE ORDER OF DEACONESSES.

BY D. SCHLEY SCHAFF.

WE propose to give a brief outline of the life of Theodor Fliedner, limiting ourselves to such facts as are indispensable to an intelligible account of the philanthropic agencies which he brought into being. Since these agencies give to his name its peculiar interest, the great bulk of the article will be devoted to an account of their origin, character and development, with special reference to the history of the Kaiserswerth Order of Deaconesses.

Theodor Fliedner was born on the twenty-first of January, 1800, at Eppstein, a little village in western Germany, eleven miles from Wiesbaden. We pause at the mention of this name, associated as it is with gaming and licentiousness. And as we think of the evil influences for which it was the rallying point for so many years, and of the notoriety it obtained, we cannot refrain from contrasting with it the retirement of its next neighbor, and the reputation it deserves (but has not) as the birthplace of one of the most active and successful philanthropists of the century. Theodor was one of twelve children. His father, the village pastor, died soon after his son's confirmation, in 1813. The destitute condition in which he left his widow awakened the sympathies of his friends. It was the generosity of two of these that enabled the young orphan to secure a thorough classical and collegiate education. He passed successively from the Gymnasium to the Universities of Giessen and Göttingen. At the Gymnasium he began to manifest his proclivities by the perusal of every available work of travels. This continued to be, throughout his student-life, his principal source of recreation, giving stimulant and strength to that spirit of enterprise which ever stood out as a prominent feature in his character. At Göttingen, he came under the influence of that celebrated, though somewhat rationalistic, theologian, Eichhorn. Of all his professors, this one seems to have had the largest share in developing his mind. He completed his theological studies at the Seminary of Herborn, in the then Grand Duchy of Nassau.

As is quite usual with German students, Fliedner followed up the completion of his theological course with a year's experience at teaching, and accepted the position of private tutor in a family of Cologne. During the engagement grave doubts arose in his mind concerning his call to the ministry. The nearer the year drew to its close, the more firmly he resolved to abandon all idea of preaching, and to devote his life to teaching. But it was not the will of Providence that this resolution should be carried into execution. *L'homme propose, mais Dieu dispose.* He had hardly begun the necessary preparation for the teachers' examination, when there came to him a call from the little congregation of Kaiserswerth. His resolutions suffered an immediate reversal. The voice of the little community was as effectual in converting him from his purpose, as the direct call was effectual in metamorphosing a Saul of Tarsus into a Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles. It was like a wave of wind which chased away all his mental difficulties as unrestrainedly as did the cry, which tradition says rose from the assembled council at Milan, "Ambrose, Bishop!", all further thought of legal practice and civil authority from the mind of a man whom God thus called to become a strong pillar of the Christian Church. Fliedner seems not to have hesitated a moment in rendering a decision. Not even was the penurious salary of 180 Prussian dollars sufficient to raise an obstacle to his acceptance.

The town of Kaiserswerth is situated on the river Rhine, a few miles below Düsseldorf. The population had originally, without an exception, been Roman Catholic. But in the latter part of the last century a Protestant element had been introduced in the transfer from Crefeld of experienced laborers, to work in its silk manufactory. This handful of evangelical men had kept on increasing for half a century, until at the time when Fliedner received the call, in 1822, they numbered in all two hundred.

The young and beardless pastor began his labors. But he had not been settled in his parish four weeks before the manufactory closed. This event threw most of his parishioners out of employment, and left them wholly unable to provide for the maintenance of a spiritual instructor. This was a severe trial for the sanguine minister. The Prussian government offered him a position, with a salary both larger and certain of payment. He saw destitution staring him in the face at Kaiserswerth; plenty and comforts in the new field. This was the dilemma. The certainty of the one seemed to correspond with the inevitableness of the other. How many in like circumstances would hesitate long in their decision in favor of the new sphere? Fliedner gave the proposition of the government no serious consideration. If his congregation had needed him in the time of their prosperity, surely they needed him much more since adversity had entered their dwellings. He did not consider the dark and lowering clouds that overcast his sky; his thoughts were fixed on the troubles of his people, who now were so much in need of the comforting and consoling influences of the Gospel, to ward off despondency. It was not in the man to forsake the vessel when the fuel had all been consumed from the hulk.

What the means of the congregation made impossible for them to do for themselves, he decided should be done for them. Their poverty should not be a cause to debar them from hearing the Word. He formed the resolution of collecting a fund, whose annual interest should be sufficient for the support of a pastor. In these trying circumstances he had been buoyed up by faith and fired by an indomitable will. The poor success which his efforts to this end met in the vicinity of Kaiserswerth, induced him to extend his journey to Holland and England. This occurred in 1823 and 1824, and must be especially noticed. In regard to the results, sufficient be it to say, that his call met with a hearty response, and he returned with the sum proposed.

We may now be said to have arrrived at the close of the first great division of his life. We now enter upon the second, which is distinguished from the other by the public character of his labors. It begins with the year 1824, and extends to the time of his death, 1864.

In addition to his arduous duties at Kaiserswerth, he was engaged, in the years comprised between 1824 and 1849, in extensive travels, and in the foundation of most of the institutions of which we shall speak below. In 1849 his engagements had so increased as to make imperative the resignation of his charge, which he had revived, and which he had sustained with happy results for twenty-seven years. The next two years were spent in prolonged travels in connection with institutions similar to those of Kaiserswerth. It was at this period that he made his first visit to the East and his only one to the United States.

In 1854 the University of Bonn conferred on him its highest academic honor. In a country where the degree of Doctor of Divinity is bestowed with great caution, and only on men eminent for literary attainments and sometimes on those whose labors have created some new mode of exerting Christian philanthropy, this recognition of his energy, zeal and success is a sure pledge of the high esteem in which his efforts were held.

The last seven years of his life were spent in comparative quiet at Kaiserswerth. He had been a sufferer for many years from his lungs; but God had not allowed his zeal to abate, nor physical or mental weakness to close his active service until it was closed on the fourth of October, 1864, by death. "He hath overcome death—conqueror" he uttered in a feeble whisper, and then came the last. These glorious words, pregnant with meaning on the lips of a departing soldier of Christ, were the last utterances of one who is a prominent example of an earnest, humble and self-sacrificing Christian, and the last testimony to the power of the Gospel on his soul. A long train of mourners at his funeral from near and far in that vicinity testified to the honor in which he was universally held.

Let us now proceed to the consideration of those benevolent institutions which make Fliedner's life a matter of history in the Christian Church. In grouping them together, we shall have respect to arrangement as well as to chronological sequence. Our principal reason for presenting them thus in a compact group is that their magnitude and importance may commend themselves to our minds in all their force.

We may conveniently treat of the Kaiserswerth institutions under two heads, and they deserve to be so treated: *First*, REPRODUCTIONS of institutions which Fliedner met with in Great Britian, the Netherlands, or parts of Germany outside of the Rhenish provinces, and, *Second*, CREATIONS of his own; *i. e.* such institutions as he originated.

I. Under the head of REPRODUCTIONS, or imitations, belong:

1. A PRISON ASSOCIATION. On his visits to Holland and England in 1823 and 1824, he had interested himself in all the agencies for the amelioration of the physical and moral condition of the poor and outcast. He saw a new world of Christian activity in orphan asylums, poor houses, hospitals, Bible societies, and other institutions of a similar character, with which he had then for the first time become intimately acquainted. He was especially impressed with the comfortable arrangements of the prisons, and with the efforts that were being put forth for the moral elevation and spiritual enlightenment of their occupants. The neglected condition of the prisons of his own land presented a sad contrast to those of England. He returned to his home deeply ashamed of the inertness and hebetation of Christian men in Germany in this direction. No William Allen or Elizabeth Fry had yet appeared beyond the waters of the English Channel to dispel the spiritual atrophy that darkened every cell. The thick prison walls had veiled it from Christian workers.

Fliedner felt the need. He wrote no pamphlets, he called no public meetings. He was convinced of the want and set to work quietly to supply the remedy. He requested and obtained permission from the proper authorities to preach at the Düsseldorf jail. It is an interesting circumstance that the person who afforded him the most material aid in the enterprise was a Roman Catholic by the name of Wingender. This stamped it in its very first beginning with a catholic spirit. October the ninth, 1825, witnessed the first service held by Fliedner at the Düsseldorf penitentiary, which was the first ever held there, and, perhaps, the first, in any of the prisons of the Rhenish Provinces. He speaks in the following terms of the accommodations: "Our audience room was two adjacent cells. The straw mattresses (bags) had been removed to one corner, and the audience sat on the floor. The sill of the door connecting the apartments supplied the place of an elaborate pulpit. The male part of my hearers sat in the cell to my right, the women on my left, etc." He continued the service on the afternoons of alternate Sundays, and not without considerable inconvenience to himself, as he was obliged to walk both ways to and from Kaiserswerth.

In 1826 he visited *incognito* all the principal prisons in the Rhenish Provinces. After careful observation he gives the following account: "The church had forgot the prisons, so far as the spiritual wants of the convicts were concerned, and none the less the State, in its provision for the health and morals. There was no provision for the instruction of the younger portion of the imprisoned; and so far as the older portion went, they were huddled together without regard to sex. They were training schools for the indulgence of the lowest passions. There was no proper provision for ventilation; and while the filth was intolerable, and the rations scanty and unwholesome, the inspectors lived in luxury." We also cull from his table of statistics to the effect that of the 320 convicts at Düsseldorf, 90 could not read and 150 were unable to write; of 280 at Cologne, 130 could not read. The conviction which the neglect of prisoners had excited, this thorough investigation strengthened into a determination to bring about, if at all possible, a general prison reform. There was no doubt of the duty of Christian people in this matter. He agitated the subject among his friends and succeeded in forming a Prison Association at Düsseldorf. This was the first institution of the kind in Germany. The object it proposed to itself, was the establishment of pastors and teachers, of both the Romish and Protestant churches, at the principal prisons, and the procurement of suitable occupation for the convicted after their release. That the project was a novel one is seen in the fact that it was eighteen months before it secured the sanction of the Prussian government.

2. A Bible Society. Fliedner, no doubt received the idea from the Bible Society founded early in the eighteenth century by Canstein, and from the similar institutions in England. This society was organized at Düsseldorf in 1826, and still continues its work of

distributing copies of the Bible in the Rhenish Provinces and Westphalia.

3. An ASYLUM for released FEMALE CONVICTS. On a second visit to Great Britain, in 1832, Fliedner came into personal contact with Elizabeth Fry and Dr. Chalmers. They initiated him into a more deep acquaintance with the needs of the poor and degraded. The labors of Miss Fry in the prisons, combined with the acknowledged neglect of fallen women in his own land, served to turn his attention in a peculiar way to some methods for helping them. He conferred with friends on the subject immediately upon his return. But while every one recognized the desirability of such an enterprise of Christian charity, few acknowledged the possibility of maintaining it. His only active coadjutor in the scheme was Mrs. Fliedner, a most faithful Christian wife. After making a definite plan, for he had no money to construct any buildings or buy any furniture, he commenced the opening at Kaiserswerth, in September, 1833, of a house of refuge for released female convicts. To this he soon annexed a MAGDALEN ASYLUM, *i. e.*, an institution for the reformation of prostitutes. The first patient was not long in making an appearance. In the absence of more suitable accommodations Fliedner consigned her to a little out-house in his garden (Garten haus). During the first year the patients numbered ten.

The fortieth annual report states that up to July 1873, the asylum had given temporary protection to 627 women of this character. Most of this number, we are informed, have left it reformed and converted, and are now engaged in different spheres of usefulness. The institution expects its occupants to defray their own expenses, so far as they can. Its object is to make them adepts at sewing, knitting and kitchen work. This is of course subservient to the one great end of moral reformation. This was the first institution of its kind in Germany. The practicability of the scheme proposed is proved both by the above statistics, and the establishment of similar asylums in other parts of Europe. The results obtained in Europe should, it seems to us, set us to the consideration of the question, whether there is not a similar work to be done here in America.

4. An INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL for POOR CHILDREN. This institution, founded by Fliedner in 1835, has merely a local significance.

It grew out of the needs of the poor population of Kaiserswerth, and affords instruction free of charge in knitting, sewing and other useful household duties.

5. An ORPHANAGE for girls at Kaiserswerth. This too has merely a local importance.

6. A HOSPITAL for female lunatics, established 1849.

This completes the list, we think, of the charitable institutions which Fliedner founded after models which he found outside the limits of the Rhenish Provinces. They have all been in an eminent degree productive of results, and are, without an exception, still in operation. Some of them have become the progenitors of similar institutions scattered over different parts of Germany. Thus the dim sparks lit by the faith of Fliedner, have kindled many hearts into increased sympathy for the poor and degraded, and resulted in more zealous efforts for the physical and moral elevation of the abandoned and helpless. Keeping in mind the labors of others, we may well characterize the period of the foundation of these institutions as an era in benevolent and Christian enterprise in Germany.

II. CREATIONS. Fliedner did not confine himself to the introduction of methods of benevolence which had analogues beyond the Rhenish Provinces. He originated several new modes of exerting Christian charity, to which we shall now direct our attention. In the hands of God, he was designed to answer, to some extent, the question whether women have a sphere of labor in the Christian Church outside of their families. Let us now consider under this head, that institution which has been the subject for many articles, and concerning which there are current not a few erroneous opinions. We refer to the ORDER OF DEACONESSES.

Fliedner's rural observations in Great Britain were not circumscribed within the narrow limits of any one particular class of benevolent institutions. Like the eagle whose eye grasps all the objects below the circle of its flight and yet keeps its attention specially fixed on its prey, Fliedner seems to have watched all the methods of Christian effort, and yet, on each separate visit, to have confined his special consideration to a single one. On one trip he seems to have particularly devoted his spare time to an examination of the modes of treatment practiced in the hospitals. After an experience with many of them in Great Britain, he says: "I have often seen buildings constructed at a lavish expenditure of money. But the contrast within their walls is sad. The sick are deplorably neglected.........The attendant physicians have often complained bitterly to me of the immorality and inaptitude of the nurses." This general unfitness of the nurses, so far as training and spiritual experience were concerned, was the consideration which led to the foundation of the Order of Deaconesses. It is an institution which was established directly for the remedy of a deficiency, a means to meet an end which commended itself to Fliedner as important. It was as much the immediate outgrowth of a felt want, as were the soup-houses in the city of New York the last winter.

The Order of Deaconesses founded by Fliedner was the *creation of his own mind.* We believe that an organized class of female workers under the name of Deaconesses existed in the Apostolic Church, and that they are referred to in Rom. xvi. 1, as also in other passages of the New Testament. We know positively that such an organization of female workers did exist in the Eastern Church, continuing until the twelfth or the thirteenth century. At the same time we must again affirm that there is *no designed historical connection between these and the Order brought into existence by Theodore Fliedner.* In order, then, to guard against such an error, we should be particular in the selection of an attribute. "Deaconesses" was the name given in the absence of any equally expressive and intelligible appellation. Shall we designate the organization the "Modern" Order of Deaconesses? We think not, for this would demand some closer definition. It seems best to apply the simple terms "Order of Deaconesses of Kaiserswerth." We shall thus avoid considering Fliedner's enterprise as a restitution of the ancient order of Deaconesses..

It must, however, not be understood that Fliedner was ignorant of the existence of an organized body of female laborers at other periods of the history of the Church. He, undoubtedly, knew about them and was confirmed in his project by this knowledge. A second circumstance, which may be mentioned as having strengthened his determination, was the labors of women in the Napoleonic war of 1813–15. The comfort and consolation which was then administered on many battle-fields had become a matter of history. The contemplation of such an event could not but give him encouragement in his plan. We have already spoken of his personal acquaintance with Elizabeth Fry and her labors. The sympathetic piety of that noble woman and the abundant success of her efforts must, without a doubt, have been a third contribution to the confirmation of his purpose. The principal consideration, however, was the unfitness of hospital nurses for the care of the sick. His design was to establish a training school for nurses.

The plan had received its due amount of consideration. The question now came, where and by whom it was to be put into execution. Great enterprises at first must, as a rule, meet difficulties which are in proportion to their novelty. As has often been the case with great thinkers, who, like Coleridge, pursue new modes and lines of investigation—that they must *create* the taste which shall appreciate them, so new enterprises starting with small beginnings are generally pushed through by men of strong faith and indomitable will, and thus create for themselves, by their successful event, respect and patronage. This proved to be the case with the project before us. Fliedner preferred that its execution might be undertaken by some other than himself. He proposed in turn, as the location of the institution, Düsseldorf, Duisberg, Elberfeld and Barmen. But his good brethren alleged as an excuse the onerous character of their duties, and albeit approval was elicited from some by the mere statement of the project, others shrugging their shoulders offered gloomy predictions. All, however, agreed on these points: that Fliedner was the only man that could carry it out to a successful issue, and that Kaiserswerth was pointed out to be the seat of the institution by the very finger of God.

Fliedner returned home. If his noble heart had suffered any discouragement from the polite repulses of his brethren, or if his will had begun to show any inclinations to flag, his good wife encouraged him and dispelled his doubts by her cheering and inspiriting influences. This good woman, as has been remarked before, was her husband's coadjutor in all his enterprises up to the time of her death in 1841. (?) He found a house suited to his purpose and bought it in April, giving his note for the $2,300, which were to be paid in November. In this transaction he surely walked by faith. His salary, as we have seen, was paltry, only sufficient for the supply of his family's most necessary wants. He had received no promises of pecuniary support; but the issue justified the seemingly rash undertaking. The necessary sum was procured by loans from two Christians distinguished for their benevolence.

However, this was not the only obstacle that opposed itself to the realization of the plan at that time and at Kaiserswerth. As soon as it became noised abroad that the building was to be used for the joint purposes of hospital and a training school for nurses, the Catholic population, incited by the priests, raised a commotion which threatened even the person of Fliedner with evil consequences. All danger from this direction was happily removed by the payment of an indemnity to the neighbors.

The constitution of the "Order of Deaconesses for the Rhenish Provinces and Westphalia" had been drawn up on the last day of May, and October had been appointed by Fliedner as the time for the opening. He occupied the interval in various other preparations and in securing the services of Gertrude as nurse. Her name now stands at the head of the illuminated scroll of "Sisters." She arrived on the thirteenth of October. But as yet no patients have announced themselves. It was as if the minister were standing in his robes on the pulpit, and the company had gathered to witness the marriage, and no groom and no bride had arrived. As last there came an invalid, a Catholic servant, who, in coming, braved the maledictions of her priest. Thus all the obstacles had been overcome by the unwavering and indefatigable efforts of Fliedner, and the institution began with good prospects of success.

Now that we know the history of the origin of the order of Deaconesses, let us first examine into its character as an organization and then look at the conditions of admittance to it. When Fliedner for the first time proposed his plan, a good friend raised the following consideration against its success: "We Protestants cannot employ that lever the use of which is the secret of so much of the success of similar organizations in the Roman Church, namely the doctrine that works of mercy are in themselves meritorious, and aid to secure the pardon of sin and the joys of heaven." This principle has, undoubtedly, been not one of the least important elements which have kept in rigorous operation the Roman orders of female workers. Not less true was the statement that Protestants could not employ any such doctrine as an incitement for undertaking the work of a Deaconess. In doing this they would have pulled down one of the pillars which sustain their creed. As its constitution differs from those of the Sisterhoods of Charity in this fundamental principle, so it does in other salient points, some of which we will mention.

1. The Kaiserswerth Order of Deaconesses is independent of both Church and State. It is a self-supporting and self-governing organization. Unlike the Church in Germany, it is supported by private enterprise, and unlike the Sisterhoods of Charity, it is entirely free to move irrespective of the Church. 2. The Liturgical element is weak. The sisters are exhorted to free prayer, and are confined to no mechanical formulas in their devotions. 3. The Deaconess has the liberty of relinquishing her office at any time. She is a free agent, and often does return to her home or devotes herself to another sphere of labor. Again, she may marry at any time. This point is implied in the liberty of relinquishing her office. However, this point deserves to be particularly emphasized, that there may be no doubt about the matter. Last year seven were married. Marriage is of course, *ipso facto*, a resignation of the office of Deaconess. 4. It requires no vows whatever. 5. It discountenances, and would perhaps forbid, if necessary, the wearing of crucifixes, relics or other ornaments, which might be construed as phylacteries. 6. While it recommends simplicity in dress, it does not demand uniformity either in the cut or color of garments. All those externals, which might tend to attach to the order the idea of caste, are avoided. 7. A very prominent feature of difference must be sought for in the character of the work which the Deaconess proposes to herself. Proselytism not only underlies the activity of the Sister of Charity, but is its expressed end. The care of the sick is subservient to the winning of souls. She forces her religion on the patient. He must listen, *nolens volens*. The principle on which the Deaconess labors is in almost direct antithesis to this. The great object of her life is the alleviation of the ills of the sick, and the instruction of the ignorant. This is the only expressed object of her laboring. She does not on all occasions thrust her beliefs into the faces of her patients; conversation on

religious topics depends entirely upon them. It is voluntary with them, and not a matter of compulsion. This is certainly a very decided distinction. The example of their lives, their devotion to their office, the Christian graces they manifest, are not seldom the means of calling this forth, as we shall see further on by a comparison of the statistics. The sphere of their usefulness would on any other principle be seriously narrowed, as for example among the Mahometans of Jerusalem and Constantinople and Alexandria, as well as among the mixed congregations throughout Germany, and among the Catholics of France and Italy. The Deaconess as little confines her labors within the bounds of a particular Church as within the geographical limits of any country. Her doctrines are evangelical, but her labors reach to members of every sect. In these respects, and perhaps in others, do the Sisterhoods of Charity and the Order of Deaconesses differ.

Further, the work of the Deaconess must not be confounded with that of the Bible women, whose special work is that of evangelism by the distribution of Bibles and tracts, and conversation on religious topics. Her relation to the Deaconess of the primitive Church we shall bring out in a positive way by an exhibit of the character of her activity. It is not the object of this to be at all controversial; at the same time, we hope that all prejudices against the institution from a supposed correspondence to Roman orders in all particulars, may by this time have been removed. Their objectionable features, that is, those elements to which Protestants object, are eliminated, as we have seen.

The *conditions* of admittance to the Order are very simple. They are: 1. The applicant must not only bear the name of Christian, but show evidence of a sincere love for Christ and a longing to do His service. 2. She must present the written testimony of several persons to her moral character. 3. She must have a sound body and bring the testimony of her physician to this effect. The arduous duties of the Deaconess demand more than an ordinary amount of physical strength and endurance. Many are obliged to relinquish the work for this very reason. 4. She must not be younger than eighteen nor older than forty. Very few exceptions are made to this rule. 5. She must have a familiar acquaintance with the ordinary duties of housekeeping, such as sewing, cooking and the like. 6. She must have a fair education, and present an intelligible and self-consistent autobiography. 7. The written consent of her parents or guardians. 8. She must agree to stand as a probationer at least for six months, and for three years, if considered necessary by the directors. 9. She must be unengaged and unmarried, though she may be a widow. 10. Consent to perform the office of Deaconess for five years after the expiration of the season of probation. Such a condition is demanded by the fact that the institution at Kaiserswerth affords the training, free of all expense. Should, however, the Deaconess change her mind and decide not to serve this length of time, she has the privilege of abandoning her office, but with the promise to pay into the treasury a certain part of the amount expended in her education. Such are the simple conditions for admittance into the Order of Deaconesses. They are very few, revealing no attempt to limit personal liberty, and yet as comprehensive as we could well imagine them.

And now let us ask ourselves what the character of the work is which the Deaconess undertakes. Deaconesses are divided into two general classes: *First*, DEACONESS-NURSES (Pflege-Diakonissen) and *second*, DEACONESS-TEACHERS (Lehr-Diakonissen).

As the name signifies, the peculiar office of the first class is the treatment of the sick, and includes charitable offices among the poor and services in parishes. Their course of training once completed, they are sent to hospitals in Germany and in other lands, which are under the permanent supervision of Kaiserswerth. In addition they are sometimes, if numbers allow, permitted to nurse in private families for short seasons. The report of 1873 states that in that year fifty-eight (58) hospitals had been thus supplied by Kaiserswerth, with from two to eighteen nurses each. It is the design that at least two Deaconesses should labor together at each place, in order that there may be an interchange of advice and encouragement.

The Deaconesses were very active in the wars which were recently waged on the Continent. In the Schleswig-Holstein contest of 1864, twenty-eight accompanied the armies of Prussia, and attended the wounded and sick in the hospitals and on the battle-fields. In the war of 1866, this number was increased to eighty-six. As regards the care of the poor, the report of 1873 informs us that twenty poor-houses were under the charge of Deaconesses from Kaiserswerth in 1873.

Secondly, the general class of Deaconess-Nurses includes also the *Parish-Deaconesses.* Their duties seem in many particulars to correspond to those of the deaconesses of the primitive Church, which were the care of the poor and sick among the female part of the congregation. The Parish-Deaconess co-operates with the pastor, in building up and maintaining Sabbath-schools and sewing schools, in visiting the poor, and instructing them in the principles of cooking and washing. She is, in a word, his female aid-de-camp. That there are many services which a pastor cannot perform for his female parishioners, it is only necessary to mention in order to call to our minds many cases. If it is expected that the pastor's wife should take the responsibility of performing them, experience will show that this seldom does occur. Nor is it reasonable to expect that she, alone and unaided, should both fulfil her duties as wife and mother and perform parish duties besides. It is true that members of congregations as individuals undertake these offices very frequently. At the same time, we all of us have often seen these forces either poorly organized or lying idle for want of organization. The Parish-Deaconess steps in at this point and brings her experience to bear in directing the activity of the women. Her presence, then, is not designed to exclude the services of the female members of the individual congregation. She merely supplements them.

It is in place here to give expression to a thought in which we have indulged in connection with Parish-Deaconesses. Will they not carry with them a wholesome spiritual element into congregations? The pastors in Germany have been, and continue to be, to a large extent rationalists. They use their profession principally as a lever for the support of themselves and their families. The nourishment they impart to the longings of their parishioners is in proportion to their lack of faith in the Christ of the orthodox Christian. Pastoral work is neglected and the congregations go to spiritual ruin. German Switzerland is at this time illustrating these facts by scores of examples. Now what a rock the fidelity of their Christian women would oppose to stem the influences of infidelity and cold preaching! Labors from them in such parishes might be fraught with most happy results. This, of course, is on the supposition that the Deaconess would always stand true to her profession of Christ. Female piety is often very marked, and we feel sure that it could not fail to have brought about much fruit in the long season of the extended and utter religious indifference which has characterized a number of German congregations during the last fifty years or more.

But to pass from possibilities to facts. The labors of this class of workers, so far as they have reached, have received the testimony of universal satisfaction. In 1873 they labored in thirty-six parishes.

The second general class of Deaconesses have received the name of Deaconess-Teachers. They first undergo a thorough training at Kaiserswerth and are then graduated as teachers for infant and industrial schools. The graduates of our Normal Schools correspond to some extent to the Deaconess-Teachers. But Normal Schools resemble the training schools at Kaiserswerth in one fact only. They both educate teachers: but while the one makes as the only condition of the teacher intellectual attainments, the other adds to this those of a moral character and religious experience. The one, as a usual thing, is dependent upon the state: the other is independent of it.

In 1873 Deaconesses of this class were dispersed among seventy different educational institutions.

Their labors are, however, as in the case of the Deaconess-Nurses, not confined within the limits of Germany. They direct schools, or act as subordinate instructors, at Smyrna, Florence, Jerusalem, Bucharest, and other foreign cities. They have been very successful wherever they have gone, and the demand for them far exceeds the supply. This fact is true of both classes of Deaconesses, and leaves the success of the institution beyond the shadow of a doubt. And we cannot be surprised at it. Who does not take comfort in the thought that one's friends are under the treatment of trained and competent Christian nurses, one's children under the discipline of Christian teachers spiritually educated for their work? Any other exhibit would point to a defect either in the constitution or the workings of the institution.

The Order of Deaconesses has now completed the thirty-eighth year of its existence. We have become acquainted with the history of its origin, we have considered it in its relation to corresponding organizations in the Primitive Church and the Latin Church, and made an estimate of its character; we have studied its constitution and its spheres of activity; let us now glance at the work it has been accomplishing during the period of its history.

At the beginning of 1874, the number of Sisters then living and under the direct supervision of the Kaiserswerth *Mutterhaus* was 547. This includes probationers. They were laboring at one hundred and sixty different institutions; hospitals, orphanages, poor-houses, prisons, infant and industrial schools; and in private families and parishes. Through these channels there were brought under their care forty thousand (40,000) persons. The stations are scattered throughout Germany and extend to distant places in Europe, such as Constantinople, Pesth, Florence and Bucharest. They include further Palestine, where forty-five Deaconesses are laboring, Egypt with nine Deaconesses, and Rochester in our own country with one Deaconess. We cannot pause to give any further results of their work, except to cull from the statistics of the hospitals at Jerusalem and Alexandria. It will be most interesting to hear from those far-off cities. During the year of 1872, six hundred and seventy patients patronized the hospital at Jerusalem. Of this number five hundred and sixteen were Mahometans. The hospital at Alexandria during 1873 accommodated in all four hundred and ninety-seven. A gratifying mark of esteem for the labors of the Deaconessess is manifested in the annual contribution, amounting to 10,000 francs, of that liberal patron of modern material progress, the Khedive. Such in brief is the extent of the influence of the plant which has grown from the little grain sown by Fliedner not half a century ago. These are statistics of work being accomplished by the direct efforts of the graduates of Kaiserswerth.

But has the institution at Kaiserswerth remained the only training school for Deaconesses? In the course of these years it has become the progenitor—*Mutterhaus*, as the Germans say—of many more of the same kind. It is a plant, which has not only been sustaining Christian enterprise: it has been generating seeds which have fallen in many places, and have in turn become healthy plants. It is Gray who says so beautifully,

> "Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
> And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

This truth does, no doubt, illustrate the history of many Christian efforts. But it has not been so with this one. It was not long before the fame of Kaiserswerth was carried beyond the narrow limits of the Rhenish provinces. The desire to which the report often gave rise among good people, was often made to blossom into a new institution for the training of Deaconesses by the indefatigable energy of Fliedner. During his life he saw laid the cornerstones of thirty (30). They were established in quick succession, between 1841 and 1864, at Paris, Strasburg, Dresden, Utrecht, Berlin, Stockholm, Stuttgart, Hamburg, Berne, London, Copenhagen, and other cities. Our own country was not to be left without one. In 1849 Pastor Fliedner brought over several Deaconesses, whom he placed at Pittsburgh, to serve as a nucleus for an institution. The attempt has proved a moderate success, but it has been cramped in enlarging the sphere of its activity by the small number of applicants for the office. Mr. Passavant, the director, has kindly informed us that it is now supplying eight hospitals and orphan asylums with nurses. It has, in direct connection with it, at Pittsburgh, an orphanage.

Up to the time of the death of Fliedner, the thirty institutions had educated and graduated fifteen hundred and ninety deaconesses. The institutions had increased to thirty-four in 1867, and the number of Deaconesses to seventeen hundred.

Let us now for a moment look back and reconsider this history. We see Fliedner alone, with no coadjutor but his wife, beset by poverty, and opposed by the prejudices of the Catholic villagers—we remember Gertrude and the one invalid—and now we hear the name of Kaiserswerth uttered in many parts of the world, and we contemplate the results of its influence, in one form or another, not only in every part of Germany, but in France, and Holland, and Italy, and Switzerland, and Sweden, and Denmark, and Turkey, and far-off in Africa, Asia, and America. We are astounded by the result.

It has not at all been our purpose to discuss the question of woman's work in the Church. But if this brief sketch of the Order of Deaconesses does, to some extent—perhaps to a large extent—answer it for many minds, it will not surprise us.

The Order of Deaconesses is one of the institutions originating with Fliedner's effort; there is yet one more, and we shall content ourselves with the simple mention of its object. We have reference to the HOUSE OF REFUGE FOR SERVANT GIRLS, founded at Berlin, in 1854. The purpose of this institution has been to afford a temporary home for sick and enfeebled servant girls, and to give instructions in the culinary department and the work of a chambermaid. During the past twenty years it has given lodgings and instruction to over nine thousand women of this class of society. The success of the object may be inferred from the fact that the applications to it for help exceed by five times the capacity of supply. The imperial pair of Germany have been in close sympathy with it, and have contribnted in large sums to its support, as they have to the support of all the Kaiserswerth institutions. As in the case of the Order of Deaconesses, this has given birth to similar enterprises in different parts of Germany.

We have now completed our sketch of the Kaiserswerth institutions, and will only add that the amount necessary for their support is within a fraction of 100,000 Prussian dollars yearly. The present management is under the able direction of a son-in-law of Dr. Fliedner, Pastor Disselhoff, and his widow, Mrs. Fliedner. Fliedner somewhere says in one of his works, "I feel that my own life is only a vapor, which lasts but a little while, and then vanishes away." (*Ich fühle das mein eigenes Leben auch nur ein Dampf ist, der eine kleine zeit währet, darnach aber verschwindet er.*)

When we first read the above confession, we felt a slight chill of sadness creep over us. But the feeling of sadness has given place to one of deep admiration; for these words give utterance to the humility of an eminent servant of God. His life was spent unostentatiously, but his influence has been as gladdening on the Church as is always the introduction of a rare and odorous exotic into a garden of flowers.

Art. IV.—ABSOLUTION.

REV. M. KIEFFER, D. D.

It has often become necessary for those who write from our common Christian stand-point to remind their readers of the necessity and importance of occupying substantially the same ground with themselves, in order that they may apprehend and understand fully the subjects under consideration.

Only those who are conscious that there is a God can be profited by theological lectures or articles on the Divine Being. Only those who are Christians can "comprehend, with all saints, what is the height and depth, the length and breadth of the love of God in Christ Jesus."

The clearest and fullest exposition of faith is without profit to him who has no faith. An idea of colors cannot be conveyed to the mind of a man who has never been blessed with the sense of sight. The elevated and elevating science of Æsthetics has no meaning for him who has no sense of the beautiful. It is in vain to unfold the principle of morality to him who has not "the moral sense," just as it is in vain to speak of sounds and harmony to one who has no ear to hear. Thus when the preaching of St. Paul was rejected by many in the cultivated city of Corinth, because it had not in it enough of the wisdom of this world, or because it was not sustained by miracles, he defended himself against his learned accusers by simply taking the ground that they were incompetent to decide the question; "for the natural man receiveth not the things which are of the spirit of God." "The world by wisdom knew not God." "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. *But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit.*"—[1 Cor. ii. 9, 10.]

From this we infer that rightly to know God and the things of

God, the soul must be in its proper attitude before Him. To become fully conscious of the rich contents of our undoubted Christian faith, we must stand in the faith. We must stand in the UNITY of the faith, since there is but "one faith, one Lord, and one baptism," and "one God and Father of us all."

The various branches of natural science may be studied separately. But no sound philosophical thinker will maintain that a part of nature's kingdom can be properly understood, unless it be studied in its concrete union with the great whole. The partial student, who is content with the part, or imagines that he has all the truth in his particular branch of study deceives himself, and does not even know the truth of his own department. In the eyes of the catholic student of nature he is stultified. He may have numbers, even a majority agreeing with him; that does not help his case. He is stultified nevertheless. So in regard to the articles of our Christian faith, or the facts and doctrines of our holy Christian religion. We may study them separately; but to do so at the expense of their concrete unity, is to introduce anarchy and confusion into the great realm of religious thought.

With such anarchy the Church has been afflicted, and sorely tried, in every period of her history. Errors and heresies, such as the Arian, the Nestorian, the Eutichian, the Sabellian, and the Pelagian, &c., constantly re-appear; and the articles of faith and doctrine once settled over against the ancient heresies, must be resettled, (as it seems,) in the consciousness of the Church in every succeeding age. Perhaps there has never been a greater confusion of religious ideas than there is at the present time. The cause of all this we believe to be that here named. In the religious thinking of the day the articles of our faith have come to be "*disjecta membra.*" In this realm every one seems to be his own king. His own subjective notions are the standard of orthodoxy. "All are right, if only they are sincere." So the word goes in the way of apology! Yet, in the view of the individual every one is wrong except himself. The article of our common faith, which we are now about to take into consideration, namely, the "Forgiveness of Sins," has been made to suffer especially in the way described. Separated from its proper connection with the creed it has lost almost entirely its original and true meaning. Even amongst those who lay the strongest claim to evangelical orthodoxy, and make great account of the atonement, the sufferings and death of Christ, there is, in many instances, but a vague sense of sin and guilt. The addresses of the people to a throne of grace, are, to say the least, not well ordered; and often, after praying round the world, when the journey is well-nigh ended, we hear the rapid conclusion as follows: "and forgive our sins for Christ's sake, Amen." It is only too evident that the true sense of this article of our "undoubted Christian faith" is to a great extent lost amid the general confusion of religious ideas and subjective notions that characterize our time.

To aid in bringing order out of this confusion, and in awakening the Church so a proper consciousness of sin and guilt, in connection with the true meaning of *absolution*, is our present design.

In the economy of grace we are confronted by two mysteries: viz: "the mystery of iniquity," and "the great mystery of godliness, God manifested in the flesh." They exist in the world in the form of two kingdoms: "the kingdom of darkness," and "the kingdom of marvelous light," "the kingdom of this world," and "the kingdom of God." These stand opposed, the one to the other; they are distinct communions and have no fellowship, the one with the other, as light has no fellowship with darkness, and as righteousness has no communion with unrighteousness.

They both exist in the world historically. History is the development of human life. This may be either normal or abnormal. "The mystery of iniquity" is the abnormal development of human life from the time when our first parents sinned and fell, until the final consummation of all things, or until this old creation shall have become entirely new. It is as broad and deep as humanity itself. It works in all the deep recesses of man's inner being, it reveals itself in all the forms of his outward activity, and affects with the most awful consequences all the relations by which he is affiliated and joined to the natural world around him; so much so that the very earth is cursed for his sake. The mystery of godliness, "God manifested," and God manifesting himself, "in the flesh," is the *normal* development of human life, the process commencing with the earliest dawn of the supernatural revelation and going forward with the cycles of the ages until humanity shall have reached its consummation of bliss and glory in the heavenly world. This is the history of Redemption; *Redemption* as foretold and typified in the Old Testament dispensation, and fulfilled in the New.

By studying closely the relation of this normal development to the abnormal we shall learn that they are cotemporaneous. As soon as the mystery of iniquity begins to work, as soon as sin enters the world, so soon does the idea of redemption commence the process of its actualization. The history of our race does not antedate the history of redemption. "Christ was slain from the foundation of the world." Nor must we suppose that the process of profane history is more rapid than that of sacred history, so that the one can reach its goal before the other. According to the strictest measurement of time and space the idea of redemption is as broad and deep as humanity. No human thought or volition can go beyond it.

Yet this idea, broad and comprehensive as it is, according to its strict meaning, has its limit. It is relative, and its actualization is bounded by man's *need* of redemption.

But in its origin it is divine, it is God's eternal and boundless love. In love He created all things. In love, He made man in His own image. In his primeval state man stood *consciously* in the divine love; yea, in the very love that becomes redemptive (as soon as sin enters) and manifests itself more and more as redeeming power in the world's history. "God is love," and hence it lay in His very nature to manifest Himself in the form of the natural creation. This is the first actual birth from the womb of eternity. It is the child of eternal love. Love is the holy bond that unites all the parts of the creation, whether celestial or terrestial, in one great organic unity. In the divine love stands the unity of the Godhead—the unity of all the divine perfections and attributes—so in it stands also the concrete unity of all that God has made.

Thus in the creation God is glorified; and just because the creation culminates in the personal creature, and finds in him the conscious medium through which it would declare God's glory and praise; just because man is made in God's image, in righteousness and true holiness, "that he might rightly know God his creator, heartily love Him and glorify and praise Him forever:" *i. e.* just because in his person are centered all the excellencies of created existence, whilst at the same time he mirrors the perfections and glories of the Divine Being, does sin as soon as he commits it, involve him in the most aggravated guilt and the most awful consequences." Were the creation not a unit, were there no organic union between the personal creature and the impersonal, between the subjective and the objective; were each a separate creation by itself, then certainly the sin of the one could not bring a curse upon the other. And were there no organic unity of the race, were each human individual an entirely distinct and separate creation by himself, though crowded closely together, the sin of the one could not in that case in any way become the sin of the other. Then the sinner might die, because he is a sinner, and the others might all live, because they have not sinned. This were *indeed* an illustration of individualism. But from suppose cases we can gain nothing more than an illustration of hypotheses. The case in hand is real, most awfully and profoundly real. Nature is one, notwithstanding its multiformity, and its endless diversity. The impersonal creature is not without the personal. They are one, vitally united as soul and body. No part exists for itself, nor in itself; but all the parts of the grand organism are animated and held together by one common law. Nor is this the law of independent existence by any means; for we know that relative being must necessarily ground itself in the Absolute. The creation *is* because God is: it is in *Him* that all things consist.

This idea of the concrete unity of all the parts of the natural creation, in connection with the fact that the whole has the ground of its being in God, and that it is the form of His self manifestation we must ever keep in mind in order to form a correct view of our subject.

We are taught in our Symbol of Faith that to enjoy the Christian comfort we must know "how great our sins and miseries are," how we are to be delivered from them, and how are to express our gratitude to God for such deliverance. We are also told that we may know our sin and misery out of the law of God: "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. iii. 20. "I had not known sin but by the law." Rom. vii. 7. Then immediately the question is very properly asked: "What doth the law of God require of us?" "Christ teacheth us that briefly," etc.

Here we are in a plain path; but in entering upon it many stumble and fall, not from any defect in the Symbol, but because they proceed too rapidly. Without studying the perfect law of God, in its general, or all-comprehensive nature; without looking properly into this sea of being and existence by which we are apprehended, they proceed at once to the *requirements* of the law. They virtually ignore the Third Question, and at once take up the Fourth. To be "practical," the application of the sermon is made in the absence of the sermon. The special, the particular, is insisted upon, in the absence of the general to which it belongs. The requirement is made, but the deep and comprehensive ground in which it rests is not so much as named. Thus the law of God is resolved into a mere requirement, or precept, or at best a well-defined rule of life. In the mind of the abstract thinker it is of course a mere abstract rule, standing in no concrete union with either the divine or human life.

Any one can see that according to this view, sin, "the transgression of the law," is comparatively a mere triviality. True, the sinner has been disrespectful to the Great Lawgiver; he has insulted the High Majesty of heaven; but what of it? What injury has been done? A child has been naughty, a subject has been disobedient. For his good, and for the honor of the parent and king, he should be punished. So God takes the law, that has been violated, into His hand as a rod and chastises the offender, that under the smart he may be brought to grief, to repentance, and the exercise of faith in pardoning mercy. There is mercy in store on account of the sufferings endured by the Son of God upwards of eighteen hundred years ago. The law is of course good as a rod in the hands of the school-master to bring us to Christ. But looking upon it merely in this light, that is, as a means to an end, and not as having its end in itself, the question must force itself upon us: what injury has that thing called sin done which has made such use of the law necessary? To say that it has brought misery and suffering into our world, is not a satisfactory answer to the question. It is conceded that suffering is not an evil *per se;* and as for misery, why should that be deplored, since the more deeply we feel it the greater is the happiness that succeeds as soon as we are delivered from it? If sin and misery have brought the Son of

God into our world, in whom we have complete redemption, even everlasting life and endless happiness, why deplore that sin and misery? If by my own fault I have fallen from the earth into a deep below, and God pities me and takes me up to a more glorious abode in heaven, why should I be sorry for either the fault or the fall?

We intend no caricature. The subject is difficult. We ask these questions just here to show that the usual forensic view of sin and its pardon through Christ fails, in this *abstract* way, to satisfy the demands of truth. By a single step (as the history of modern theology clearly shows), the transition is made from this standpoint to that of the rationalist. In the very nature of the case the apprehension of sin and misery, as the *occasion* of the divine love taking the form of pardoning mercy, suggests the thought that it is an *advantage* and not an evil. So the rationalist believes, so he teaches: "That which thy Bible and the Church call sin, is not an evil, but an element of humanity itself, essential to its complete development, and that which is set forth as the pardon of sin, and man's reconciliation to God through his Son, is the form in which this process of development completes itself in the personal consciousness."

Thus the evangelicalism of our day whilst it has a holy horror of all churchly tendencies, stigmatizing them as ritualistic (as though Christianity could be without its *ritus*), is at once the occasion and the strenth of rationalism. The mode adopted to counteract extreme tendencies by the advocates of the opposite extreme, namely, sharp discussion, is a sad proof of itself that there is not a proper sense of "sin and misery." This is too evident from the party strife of our time. All must admit that it does not breathe the spirit of penitent faith. He that misrepresents, all the time, the views that differ from his own, has he learned his sin and misery out of the law of God? Does he who is sticking you with a pin while he is praying at your side really desire the pardon of his sin or of yours?

Does the evangelicalism of our day produce the Christian fruit of repentance unto life? By the fruit the tree is to be judged, and not by the rustling of its leaves. Where do we find the deepest sense of sin and guilt, and the most devout thanks for pardoning mercy?

Do we find them in the confessional? Let the holy life of those who go to the confessional give the proof. We want to see the good fruit. If this great Roman catholic tree, at which we are just now looking, be good, it will bring forth good fruit, but if evil, it will bring forth evil fruit. If Roman catholicism should authenticate itself as the absolute religion by producing in the priesthood and laity the fruits of repentance unto life, then it has gained the victory beyond all controversy. Unprejudiced Protestants, we think, would be willing to be overwhelmed by this kind of argument. But just as little as we can expect to be overcome by such self-authenticating power from that quarter, so little can we expect it from the "evangelical" Protestantism which has come to a knowledge of sin, not by the law of God, but merely (if at all) by an abstract requirement of the law.

That subjective piety, which protests indiscriminately against the objective side of religion, can never, in the nature of the case, authenticate itself as genuine and real. If *it* be the only hope of Protestantism, then the predictions of its failure are already fulfilled. It does not produce a true knowledge of sin; hence it is not truly humble, it is not penitent, it does not bring forth the fruits of holy living. "By their fruits ye shall know them." "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." If sin then be something entirely different from what it is in the mind of the rationalist, and if the conception of it by our modern unchurchly Evangelicals be inadequate, superficial and empty, how can we truly know our "sin and misery?" This knowledge we are expressly taught, is by the law. But the law as we have seen is something vastly more than a precept, a commandment, or a requirement. In its generality it includes all commands, precepts, and special requirements. These can only be known properly in their concrete connection with it. The law of God is his *will* in its general and special relation to the whole creation and all that is in it. It is as comprehensive as the universe. It may be known by different names as it reveals itself in the different departments of the universal kingdom. Yet it is one, holding all the parts together, as said, in one concrete unity. Even that which is known to us as the natural and supernatural Revelation is only a two-foldness. Not two divine wills are revealed, but only one. Not two Gods have spoken to us, the one in His works, and the other in the form of the Inspired Word: the one only true God has spoken in this two-fold way.

True, the law of nature (Gesetz) is something settled and fixed. Its order is established. Nature is not God; the law of its life is distinct from His, yet His will is the supreme law determining and controlling all events, so that nothing comes to pass by chance. This holds in regard to the personal creature, as well as the impersonal.

Man is in a special sense autonomic. Yet he is not independent. He has his being in another, from whose presence he cannot escape Individuality holds in its generality. Personality, (will and intelligence in their identity) though self-moving, has all the springs of its life and activity in the Absolute Person.

Solemn and sublime thought; personal creatures, angels and men, an innumerable company, (the universe is full of them) living, moving, thinking, breathing, in God, the Absolute Person, who rules supreme, and whose holy will unites all in one holy catholic communion. God's law revealed, and ever revealing itself, in this general concrete form, gives us a knowledge of his personal character. He is holy, just, true, good. Yea, He is personal holiness, justice, truth, goodness, love. So the revelation of His will as law is the revelation of Himself. Surely then it is not the law-knowledge *out* of God that gives the knowledge of sin, but that knowledge in Him; and this knowledge we have in Christ His Son, who is the fulfilment of the law.

This not the place to discuss the possibility of sin (the *posse peccare*), nor its origin. Both are verified by its presence in our world.

The question is: how can we know our sin, so as to be delivered from it? There are words that, when they are allowed to speak for themselves, convey their own ideas much more fully and forcibly than they can be conveyed by definitions. This is the case with the word *sin*. According to its etymology, as given by some (*σίνομαι*) it means injury, damage, loss, ruin, depravity, as involving guilt. Sin then is unholiness, injustice, iniquity, badness, hate; just the opposite of God, against whom it is primarily committed.

It is for this reason, we think, that the world's iniquity is spoken of as a mystery. It is the mystery of human life itself in the process of abnormal development. This is general: "*All* flesh has corrupted its way before God." Man has sinned, so all men have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.

The idea of human sin is general, we say, and squares with that of humanity. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the *sin* of the world." As individual human life, and thought, and action, stand in the general life of the race, so all sins, whether committed in thought, word, or deed, imply the presence of sin. It individualizes itself as does humanity.

Here then we are confronted by a three-fold generality: 1. The all-comprehensive law of God, as identified with His own Being, as made known in nature, and as revealed in the Old and New Testaments.

2. Humanity, individualized in the world's history.

3. Sin, in all the special forms of its power and guilt.

The three present themselves in *one* concrete view. Humanity beholding itself in the light of the divine revelation sees its own sinfulness and depravity. This is what St. Paul means, we think, when he says: "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Not the law merely as a moral precept, for in another connection he saith, "He that offends in one point offends in all;" but the law which is the very revelation of God himself. God, as said, is a personal Being, and has a character. He is holy, of purer eyes, than to behold iniquity. It is this knowledge of God that gives us an overwhelming sense of our sin and guilt. The whole history of God's people testifies to the truth here set forth.

When Moses received the law in the form of the ten commandments, it was not this that caused him to fear and tremble, but it was the presence of God, who had called him to an audience with Himself upon Mount Sinai.

It was when realizing this same Divine presence in the Temple that the inspired prophet exclaimed: "O God, I am unclean, and dwell among a people of unclean lips." So generally the pious of all ages when they come into God's presence to worship Him devoutly acknowledge first of all their unworthiness and guilt.

O sinful and guilty man, what hast thou done? God made thee in His own image, in knowledge, in righteousness, and holiness; but thou hast defaced that image; thou hast shut out the divine light from the inner chambers of thine own being; thou hast thrown off and torn to shreds the spotless robes of righteousness and holiness, and hast taken from Satan (God's enemy), the clothes of an abject slave, and dost wear them as thine own. God breathed into thee the breath of divine life, and made thee a temple for his indwelling that thou mightest commune with Him, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, forever, and he with thee; but thou didst extinguish this life within thee; thou didst turn God out of this, his own temple, and hast consecrated it to the service of Baal. God created the universe as a temple, in which the Shekinah is to dwell forever, and placed thee in it as prophet, priest, and king; but thou didst desecrate that temple, and didst turn it into a "den of thieves." God placed thee in the communion of the good, the relative good and the absolute, by baptizing thee as his child; the holy angels were thy brothers, their home your home; but you left that holy communion, the communion of light, of love, and joy; and didst join thyself with a herd of swine, yea, worse, a herd of fallen angels and damned spirits. God made thee the father of a great family; thy sons are as numerous as the stars of the natural heavens, and were designed to shine as brighter stars in a brighter firmament; in them God would actualize the eternal ideal of sonship; but thou by thy sin hast made thyself, and all these, the children and slaves of Satan. The wages of this thy sin is death; death spiritual, temporal, and eternal. This thou hast brought upon thyself and all thy posterity.

Just here we deem it of the utmost importance to guard against all those theological views and teachings which have a tendency to palliate man's sin and guilt.

It is conceived, for instance, that, after God had created man, He left him to himself for some wise purpose, and the enemy taking advantage of this circumstance, succeeded in overcoming him who was too weak to stand alone.

Only in this way, it is thought, can man's sin and fall be accounted for. God saw the danger of His child. He saw the serpent from a distance. He knew all that passed in the way of temptation, yet He did not interpose. "God permitted it."

"The sin and fall of man fulfills a permissive decree." "God permitted the fall of man that He might glorify Himself in human redemption."

This, we are aware, is not intended as a palliation for man's guilt; but it is so in fact. If the view be correct, we can't see that man is so very blameworthy or guilty after all. He has been unfortunate and deplorably miserable for a time; but, as previously intimated, we are unable to see how a consciousness of misery can awaken within us a consciousness of guilt, since it is to be succeeded by a state of happiness and joy.

If God permits a ship to be dashed to pieces so that He may show forth His miraculous power and wisdom in rebuilding it so perfect and strong that it can safely "outride" every storm, then the very misfortune of that ship has certainly been its greatest fortune. There is nothing to deplore.

If God permitted the great temple of our humanity to be destroyed that he might build it up again, making it infinitely more glorious than before, we can't see that any human individual can regret very much that he is that temple. No, there is not the least evidence that God left man to himself a single moment for any purpose whatever. But man, standing in the very bosom of the divine love, in conscious union and communion with the good, so perverted his autonomic power as to identify his will with that of the devil. He sinned against the infinite love in which he was born and in which he consciously lived. By his disobedience, he sinned against God, against nature, and against himself. There is no excuse, no palliation. The guilt of the sin, though committed by a creature in finite form, is of infinite aggravation, because it is committed against infinite goodness and love. God did not will it or permit it in any sense of approval. On the contrary, He strictly forbade it, saying: "Thou shalt *not* eat thereof."

The conception that a secret decree or purpose was fulfilled by man when he violated and transgressed the revealed will of God, is not only wrong in that it brings the Divine Being in conflict with Himself, but it is also an unncessary expedient resorted to for the purpose of explaining that which is in itself an inexplicable mystery.

Man is a deep mystery to himself in any relation in which he may be found. And if in his history it should be discovered that by abusing the freedom of will, with which he was endowed, his normal life became abnormal, if here there is a revelation of sin, let the awful mystery be acknowledged in all the stages of its development from its beginning until its work of death is finished. Far away be the thought that God secretly permitted sin that grace might abound.

Where do we stand if we entertain this thought? Let us see. The devil is a person, we admit; let us for a moment personify sin, which man committed by his instigation, and which is his dreadful work. Then Sin and Satan come to us side by side, and say to us: " We as well as you are integral parts of God's great creation. God would glorify himself as Redeemer, as well as Creator and Ruler, and for this purpose He needs us. Our kingdom we have established by God's secret permission. Our works of darkness, of cruelty and death are all necessary to the great end in view. But for us and our work the Son of God would never have become the Son of man; He never would have made an atoning sacrifice on the cross; nor would He have become the resurrection and the life. But for us there would be no redemption, and no heaven of the redeemed."

Shall we believe this double-tongued speech of the Viper? No, God does not need sin in any person, nor in any form for the honor and glory of His name. The very thought seems to us a blasphemy. Get behind me, thou rationalistic Satan. Any one who is accustomed to thinking closely can easily see; for instance, that, if man's sin is in any sense necessary or essential to his being and well-being, there is no possibility of his redemption. Humanity cannot be redeemed from that which is essentially human.

As sin is ungodliness, so it is also an unnaturalness, and consequently, because man is an integral part of nature, it is in the fullest sense of the word an "UNHUMANNESS." Hence its universal condemnation. God is terribly displeased with it in all the forms of its development, and will in no case allow it to go unpunished. As said in the Book of Proverbs, chap. xi., v. 21., "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." See also Romans, chap. i., v. 18. "The wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness, and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness."

All nature joins in the condemnation. "Because that which may be known of God, is manifested in them, for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse," vs. 19, 20.

Human nature itself joins in the general sentence of condemnation. "Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another." Rom. ii. 15.

In all this is involved necessarily the guilt of the sinner. As said by an able writer: "Every sin doth cause a guilt, and every sinner, by being so, becomes a guilty person; which guilt consisteth in a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable to the iniquity of the sin. It is the nature of laws in general to be attended with these two, punishments and rewards; the one propounded for the observation of them, the other threatened upon the deviation from them. And although there were no threats or penal denunciations accompanying the laws of God, yet the transgression of them would nevertheless make the person transgressing worthy of, and liable unto, whatsoever punishment can in justice be inflicted for that sin committed." [Pearson.]

In other words the sinner is bound by the holy will of God, which is the law of all created existence, and especially the law of human life and activity, to make good all the injury done by his sins. Even in case he leaves off sinning, this obligation still rests upon him in regard to his past offenses. In case he has committed the sin of theft, or murder, but once in his life-time, yet he is ever after bound to anwer for his crime, and to make good the injury done. This obligation is the *peccati reatus*, spoken of so much by the church fathers, and after them by the school-men. Now to understand our subject we must observe the following fact: God ordinarily, that men may not break away from the obligation of his law, vindicates its majesty and sanctity through a *vicegerency*, and that in a two-fold form: that of the State and of the Church, answering all the relations of human life, civil, social, and religious.

The State, as we know, is a power ordained of God, and the civil magistracy is God's ministry. Through her judiciaries, and other officials, kings, presidents, and governors, the State *authoritatively* declares and pronounces offenders guilty, and punishes them as their crimes deserve. The sentence pronounced in heaven is thus pronounced on earth; that which is bound there is bound here, *i. e.*, God through the State authority, or vicegerency, binds the civil offender over to punishment, and thus the majesty of His law is vindicated, and His honor promoted. In the same sense, only in a higher and holier degree, does the Lord exercise his regal function in the Church, or in his mediatorial kingdom on earth. It is conceded on all sides, yea, even by the most unchurchly and unsacramental sects, that the Church has the divine authority to exercise discipline upon sinful and unworthy members, even to excommunication. Though they may deny in words that the keys placed by the Saviour into the hands of the apostles for the opening and closing of the doors of his kingdom, were handed over to their successors in the ministerial office, and by these again to theirs, down to the present time, yet in practice they deny their own words, in this, that they exercise the authority symbolized by those very keys. What means the list of the names of excommunicated members from the various Christian denominations (churchly and unchurchly), as reported year after year? Practice and words are very different things, and the argument of the former is always stronger than that of the latter. Thou that art opposing us for holding certain views in regard to church authority dost teach the same thing.

To decide on this question it is not at all necessary to discuss the subject of an apostolical succession. All the ministers of the different churches, without asking the question whether they stand in the line of such succession, declare with one voice that the preaching of the Gospel of Christ is to them that believe not " a savor of death unto death." " He that believeth not is condemned already." " This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." This is God's word and they declare it by God's authority, as the ambassadors of Christ.

This is sufficient for our purpose. We need not detain here to decide the question how the minister receives and holds this authority; whether immediately by an internal spiritual call from heaven, or by such call as mediated and confirmed through the church organization. The result is the same. The binding power which Christ gave to the Apostles is in force in the Church to the present day. The fact is established, and our faith in it is confirmed by the universal practice of churches of every name. The following example some years ago came under our own personal observation: An unworthy member was excommunicated from the Methodist church. The sentence of excommunication was solemnly read from the pulpit with the consent of the whole congregation. Upon meeting the minister subsequently, the excommunicated man said to him: "No human authority can shut me out of heaven, I care not for the sentence pronounced upon me." To whom the minister replied: "It is by God's authority, and by a divine sentence, the people of God acquiescing in it, that you are excluded from the communion of the church, and unless you repent of your sin and show the fruits of sincere repentance by a life of faith, you will be lost for ever as certainly as God lives." Will any one say that this binding on earth what God binds in heaven is priestly arrogance? None will say so, except, as in the case here alluded to, they have no faith at all of the divine in the human.

But it is a remarkable fact that whilst within the limits of Christendom it is almost universally conceded that the Church has power to bind authoritatively on earth what is bound in heaven, as soon as we claim for her a corresponding *absolving* power we are obliged to encounter strong opposition and prejudice. This is owing as we well know to the awful abuse of this power: priests absolving when God does not absolve, men giving and selling indulgences to sin, from motives of gain and power. But in our zealous protest against all the abominations of the papal confessional and other errors and abuses, we must remember that it is our duty to disengage the underlying truth from the errors and abuses that ground themselves upon it. The very presence of the errors and abuses in this case show that there is such truth underlying them. And the question for us to solve is whether the true idea of forgiveness of sins demands the presence and exercise of such absolving power in the church.

In regard to the sacred record of the objective fact of the atonement there is no dispute. "Almost all things by the Law were purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb. ix. 22). This was the type of Christ's suffering and sacrificial death, who "once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." (Heb. ix. 26.) "This man offered one sacrifice for sins." (Heb. xi. 12). "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." "The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all." (Isa. liii. 5, 6.) "He who knew no sin hath become sin for us:" *i. e.* a sin-offering. "He hath become the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." "Because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again." "In whom we have redemption through his blood; the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Thus we believe, according to these and many other scriptures of the same import, as we have been taught from our earliest youth, concerning the forgiveness of sins: "That God, for the sake of Christ's satisfaction, will no more remember my sins, neither my corrupt nature, against which I have to struggle all my life long, but will graciously impute to me the righteousness of Christ, that I may never be condemned before the tribunal of God."

This article of our faith implies necessarily belief in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and just as necessarily faith in the Holy Catholic Church, and the communion of saints. "For many ages," we are informed by the best authority, "it immediately followed the belief in the Holy Church, and was, therefore, added immediately after it, to show that the remission of sins was to be obtained in the Church of Christ." "For being the creed was at first made to be used as a confession of such as were to be baptized, declaring their faith in the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost, in whose name baptism was administered; they propounded unto them the Holy Church, into which by baptism they were to be admitted, and the FORGIVENESS OF SINS, which by the same baptism was to be obtained; and therefore in some creeds it was particularly expressed: "*I believe one baptism for the forgiveness of* *sins.*" The Constantinopolitan creed: "We believe in one baptism for the remission of sins." The lesser and larger creeds of Epiphanius: "We believe one baptism for the remission of sins," and "We believe one holy apostolical church, and one baptism of repentance."

Now the necessity and importance of the vital union of the articles of our faith, and especially this article of the forgiveness of sins, with that of the Church (the "communion of the saints," being regarded as the form of this vital union), arises from the very nature of the "full satisfaction" which Christ has made for our sins.

This word "satisfaction" is much more scholastic than it is scriptural; but as it has become canonized, we shall not discard its use. Rightly interpreted, it means that God in his Son, by the Holy Ghost, has made (*facio*), or done sufficient (*satis*), or enough for man's deliverance from sin, his complete restoration and the full actualization of his proper ideal.

Various and many figures of speech have been used by the schools to set forth this idea. Sin has been conceived to be a debt, which the sinner is unable to pay; and this debt Christ has fully liquidated: "Ye are bought with a price!" "A sufficient price." God is angry with the wicked: "His wrath is revealed from heaven" against them; but by the one sacrifice of Christ's life the divine wrath is *fully* appeased, and God is reconciled to the sinner. The sinner is bound to suffer the penalty of the law; "he is bound to suffer extreme, that is, everlasting punishment." This punishment Christ has satisfactorily suffered in the sinner's stead.

All these forms of expression, doubtless, convey more or less truth. Yet, it seems to us, they do not go to the root of the matter. The redemption wrought out for the children of men by the Son of God, or the "full satisfaction" made for sin, must necessarily be made in and by the same human nature which hath sinned. [See Heid. Cat., Q. 16.] The penalty of the law is not only to be suffered, the debt of sin paid, and the flame of divine wrath quenched by divine blood, but humanity must fulfil that law, as Christ hath said: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven."

Accordingly the "satisfaction" made by Christ is the satisfaction made by humanity, or by "the same human nature which hath sinned." To be complete it must make good all the injury done by man's disobedience; it must square exactly with the idea of redemption (a more scriptural word), which places man where he stood before his fall, and so sanctifies him in his person, and in all his relations (to God and to nature), as to raise him to the dignity and glory for which he was designed in his creation. Beyond this we cannot force this idea, and to be complete it cannot come short of this high and holy end. This is the great atonement, the blessed reconciliation. But as we have seen and know, sin exists in the world historically, in the form of a communion of evil, or a kingdom of darkness. Hence man is represented as an alien, *i. e.*, one who, by wicked works, hath left or gone out of the kingdom of God, and taken up his abode in a foreign dominion. "And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled." Now for the very reason that sin is the abnormal development of humanity, or because it is historical, Christianity, the religion of redemption, must necessarily be historical also. Only in such view can we rely upon it as real. It is the only real normal development of humanity. In other words it is Christ's real life unfolding itself historically in the form of His mediatorial kingdom, or in the form of His church, which is His body. The sacred Scriptures are full of this thought: "The kingdom of God;" "The kingdom of heaven on earth;" "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" "Thy kingdom come." Faith in the Triune God involves necessarily, therefore, faith in His Church as the form in which the powers of His kingdom are historically revealed, and just as necessarily does this again involve faith in "the communion of saints," and "the forgiveness of sins."

All this is fully implied in the solemn commission given by the Great Head of the Church to the apostles: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." "And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." We need not stop here to decide the question whether Christ delegated the power to the apostles to remit and to retain sins in virtue of their organic union with the Church, and whether they exercised this authority as office-bearers of the Church, or whether He delegated it to them in virtue of their personal relation to Him. In either view the idea of forgiveness comes to a general actualization in the Christian communion. Hence the prayer: "Forgive us our sins, as we forgive those who sin against us." "The power holds in the church." The Christian ministry is not without the Church, as this again does not exercise its functions without its office-bearers. Here an instance occurs to us in which an apostle did absolve. "To whom ye forgive anything," saith St. Paul, "I forgive also, for to whom I forgive anything for your sakes, forgive I it in the person of Christ." (2 Cor. ii. 10.) In this reference is had to the restoration of an excommunicated member of the Church. So we find that the same principle holds in the admission of penitent believers to church membership by the sacrament of baptism. Their regeneration is "by water and the Spirit," (John iii. 5,) and this their new birth is their entrance into the kingdom of God.

"Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of your sins." "Be baptized." By whom? By what authority? And for what end? Shall we answer: "By the Spirit, according to the authority of God's word, as interpreted by the penitent himself, to the end that he may receive the assurance that his sins are forgiven." Sad perversion and fatal delusion! There can be but one true answer to these brief questions. If Christ has given the commission to baptize, then, without doubt, we must look to those thus commissioned for the true baptism; and receiving the sacrament from them, we have the true sign and seal (of God's Spirit) of the grace of regeneration, and with this the forgiveness of our sins. Thus in the "Liturgy of the Reformed Church," a penitent believer having professed our undoubted Christian faith, in which he desires to be baptized (the creed), is solemnly asked in the presence of God and the congregation: "Do you sincerely desire to be baptized in this faith, and thus receive of God the seal of your adoption?" And then in the prayer: "We give thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it has pleased thee to give this brother grace to know the greatness of his sins and misery, and to cast himself in true repentance and faith upon Jesus Christ as his only Saviour, to confess Him before men, and to *receive in Holy Baptism the sign and seal of the remission of his sins*, and of his adoption as a child of God." [Notice especially, this is not from the "Order of Worship," but from the "Liturgy of the Reformed Church."]

We have not quoted from this source to revive old differences of opinion in regard to sacramental grace; the particular point is the binding and the absolving power of the Church. According to the formula from which we have taken the above extracts, a person who is not baptized in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is not a member of the Church; he has no right to her communion. He is authoritatively received (einverleibt) into the Church by baptism, *i. e.*: he is received by a minister of the Gospel who is divinely commissioned and ordained to preach the word and administer the sacraments. The baptism, as we see from this formula, though administered by human hands, and its meaning spoken by human lips, is of God; hence the question: "Do you desire to be baptized in this faith, and thus receive *of God* the seal of your adoption?" or as in the prayer, "the sign and seal of the remission of sins."

Whatever may be our views then, in regard to sacramental grace, by almost universal consent baptism is the boundary line between proto-Adamic humanity and deutero-Adamic humanity, or the kingdom of this world and the kingdom of grace. It is not an imaginary line, nor is it one that has been arbitrarily drawn by the hand of man. It is like a river rather, that naturally divides one kingdom from another. . In its waters we *must* be washed, or (to speak in the figure of the Apostle) in its laver we must be regenerated, in order to enter God's kingdom.

If any one should object to this, on the ground, as our catechism teaches, that the kingdom of heaven is opened by the preaching of the Gospel, we need only reply that regeneration by water and the spirit is also Gospel. By no setting up of one part in opposition to the other can its power and authority be weakened. The sacrament of baptism is the first Gospel form of absolution. Every Gospel sermon preached by the ambassador of Christ is an authoritative declaration of pardon to those who repent and believe; it is to them an opening of the doors of the kingdom; but their subjective faith cannot in the nature of the case give them the assurance that their sins are forgiven until they are vitally united to Christ in regeneration. The pardon of sin, "the imputation of Christ's righteousness," are blessings enjoyed only by those who are in Christ. No mere outward or forensic justification is real. There must be a vital union, commencing in the new birth. Of this baptism is the holy visible sign and seal, confirming to the worthy recipient the preaching of the Gospel, and giving him "the comforting assurance that his sins are forgiven and that he is a child of God." It is the very form in which the "Son of Man," says: "Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee."

Here the "Scribes and Pharisees begin to reason, saying, who is this which speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone? But when Jesus perceived their thoughts, He answering, said unto them: What reason ye in your hearts? Whether is easier to say: Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say: rise up and walk. But that ye may know that the Son of man has power upon earth to forgive sins, (He said unto the sick of the palsy) I say unto thee arise, and take up thy couch, and go unto thine house." (Luke v. 21, 24.) As said by an English divine, a minister of wonderful unction and power, "There are scribes of all ages—Romish scribes, who distinguish between venial and mortal sin, and apportion to each its appointed penance and absolution. There are Protestant scribes, who have no idea of God but as an incensed judge, and prescribe certain methods of appeasing Him—a certain price—in consideration of which He is willing to sell forgiveness; men who accurately draw the distinction between different kinds of faith. . . . Men who make intelligible distinction between the work that *may* and the work that *may not* be done on the Sabbath day; who send you into a perilous consideration of the workings of your own feelings and the examination of your spiritual experiences, to ascertain whether you have the feelings which give you a right to call God a Father. They hate the Romish Scribe as much as the Jew hated the Samaritan and called him heretic. But in their way they are true to the spirit of the scribe. . . . . . They are as zealous as Scribes and Pharisees ever were for negatives; but in the mean time human nature, oppressed and overborne, gasping for breath, demands something real and living." [Robertson.]

"Is it any wonder if men and women, in the midst of negations, cry, ye warn me from the error, but who will guide me into truth? I want guidance. I am sinful, full of evil! I want forgiveness! Absolve me; tell me that I am pardoned; help me to believe it." It is not sufficient that Christ has objectively wrought out a complete redemption answering fully to man's need of the same. There must needs be a synthetic development also of the objective reality in the personal consciousness. Here as elsewhere the general is individualized. As the idea of humanity is actualized in history; *i. e.*: in the way of individual births, and the development of individual lives and characteristics, so this same human nature, as it has become in the strictest and fullest sense of the word duetero-Adamic in the person of the incarnate Lord, individualizes itself also in the way of *regeneration*, and of personal growth in grace. This is just what we mean when we say that Christianity is historical. Like every other life process, it must necessarily produce from itself. The idea that a person may become a Christian, or be born as a child of God, apart from Christianity, present as a historical reality in the form of the Church, is just as absurd as to suppose that human beings are the children of the sun and moon. *Zion* is the birth-place of the redeemed. "Of her it shall be said, this and that man was born in her...... The Lord shall count when He writeth up the people that this man was born there." "Her sons and daughters are born unto her as the dew from the womb of the morning." But as Christ is both the life and the light, so His life in us unfolds itself in the way of light. This, from the instant of birth, shineth more and more unto the perfect day. The objective fact of Christianity, God's reconciliation to us in His Son, thus becomes a fact of consciousness. It is an inward, experimental realization. "Old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new." But the case demands that this internal realization be authoritatively declared that it may give its comforting assurance, just as said by the author quoted. For example, a young gentleman and lady are truly in love with each other, and are resolved to unite in the joys and fortunes of the married life: but that does not make them husband and wife. This sacred relation is both effected and solemnized by the properly authorized minister at the hymenial altar. *He* marries them.

The naturalization of foreigners has also been used as an illustration. Thus, under the sound of the Gospel, persons hear of Christ, of salvation, and of the kingdom of grace; and a feeling of need and a desire to be saved are awakened within them; they are blessed with the prevenient grace of repentance and faith, but this cannot give them the comforting assurance of their acceptance until they are really baptized into Christ's mystical body, and until they hear from His sacred lips, "Thy faith has saved thee," "thy sins are forgiven: be of good cheer." This divine word, thus spoken, can alone satisfy this most central need of our religious nature.

In this view absolution is in its nature, and in effect, the divine reconciliation, in Christ, actualized in the personal consciousness of the penitent believer; so that he in turn is reconciled to God, to nature, and to himself. He is now where he would have been if he "never had had or known any sin," a child of God, an heir of heaven. It might seem, as was taught by Novatianus, a Roman presbyter, and by Novatus, a bishop of Africa, that such absolution in the way of regeneration by water and the Spirit, frees entirely from sin for all time to come; or if any one commits a sin after his baptism, for him there is no remission.

But the word of God, and the history of Christians of all ages, teach beyond all controversy, that justification is not yet complete sanctification. Sin still inheres. The new man is born, but the old man is not yet crucified. "While we are in this life encompassed with flesh, while the allurements of the world, while the strategems of Satan, while the infirmities and corruptions of our nature betray us to the transgression of the law of God, we are always subject to offend (from whence, whosoever saith he hath no sin is a liar, contradicting himself, and contracting iniquity by pretending innocency); and so long as we can offend, so long we may apply ourselves unto God by repentance, and be renewed by His grace and pardoned by His mercy." The truth of this is confirmed by the Lord's prayer: "Forgive us our sins, as we forgive them that sin against us." This prayer is for those who can call God, "Our Father."

Hence it follows that the absolving power is needed, not only by penitents in entering the kingdom of grace in the way of regeneration, but also by all Christians, from the time of their spiritual birth until they are entirely freed from the body of sin and death. "Absolve me, *tell* me that I am pardoned, help me to believe it," is the earnest cry of *Christian* men and *Christian* women. The Church, the spiritual mother of the faithful, has in all ages exercised the absolving power. Not merely the churches of Rome and of England have done so: but the Christian denominations do so even, who think it is blaphemy to say that sin can be forgiven except by God only. True, they have in their order of worship no forms of absolution. You hear from them no formal declarations of pardon. They would not be like the Episcopalians in that respect, or like the Lutherans, or even like the Reformed. But they do the very same thing in their own informal way. By their declarations from the pulpit, in the class-meeting, at the anxious bench, and in private interviews, they give the assurance to penitents that they are pardoned. All in fact claim in their way to satisfy this central need of human nature; *i. e.*: in their way they speak of God's love in Christ, and His power and willingness to save; and on the authority of their commission they say to the sincere penitent: "This salvation is yours." How interesting it is to notice in this regard the churchliness of the unchurchly! A man the other week, "illumined by the Spirit," and fully convinced that all the churches are wrong, offered to me personally the only true baptism and the true absolution, declaring that without these I would be lost with all the rest. The man is not crazy, either. He is just as sane and consistent as the swarming sects who have made him what he is.

The true churchly absolution is not only the constant reassurance of the forgiveness of sins as first realized in regeneration; but in addition to this it is the repetition to the penitent believer, upon every shortcoming and sin, of the words of the Son of man: "Thy sins are forgiven thee: be of good cheer."

The thought has been suggested that for all purposes of practical piety we have this declaration repeated sufficiently often in the holy communion; and that it need not be repeated on every Lord's day. Since the communion grace is the baptismal grace in the process of development, it appears to us that the suggestion has great force. But if we acknowledge its force, as we do, we are under the necessity of asserting, and we do it most firmly, that for the development of the Christian life we do not commune sufficiently often. Every Lord's day multitudes of God's people go up to His house to worship Him under a deep sense of their "unworthiness and guilt," and we agree that they need something more than absolution; they need also that flesh and blood that will nourish them unto eternal life. It is a question, in our mind, whether the declaration of pardon is not out of place except in connection with the communion service.

They should be united, however, not by less frequent declarations of pardon, but by more frequent communions. If we need the one every Lord's day, who will say that we do not need the other? True, the whole Christian life is a communion; but as we have seen, it it is also an absolution. The more the new man within us is quickened and strengthened, the more our nature is freed from the power of the old man. Whilst, however, this is our opinion and honest conviction, it is easy for us to acquiesce in the present custom of pronouncing the declaration of pardon on occasions of ordinary worship, on the principle that a part may stand for the whole. In prayer and praise, and in hearing God's holy word, we also commune. So in communing we pray, and praise, and hear. It is always edifying to comprehend the general in the particular, and the special in the general. And no one who apprehends by faith the supernatural in the natural, and the divine in the human, in the person of the Son of man, can receive from His holy lips a more comforting word than this: "Thy sins are forgiven thee." In the way here named, we in this single sentence have the assurance that God is reconciled, nature's frown is turned into a smile, and human nature, having satisfied for its sins, is certain of its own ideal.

Should any one doubt the goodness and wisdom of God in making His Son "Head over all things," and in ordaining the Church as the form of his mediatorial kingdom on earth, let him but know the nature of his own need of pardon, and he will find that his inward longing for deliverance can be satisfied in no other way. He can know nothing of the divine except through the human. It is impossible for him to love God whom he hath not seen, except by loving his brother whom he hath seen [John]. The fact that the Son of man has power on earth to forgive sins must, in the nature of the case, be believed in order to apprehend the truth that God alone can forgive sins. And finally, no one can find Christ as the great Absolver, except by the Spirit, who reveals Him unto us. But the sphere of the Spirit's saving activity, as we have seen, is the Church, Hence when Christ says, "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest," the Spirit and the Bride also say, "Come." Here is the order of the revelation: God, the Son of God (the Son of Man), the Spirit, the Church (the Bride). But in the synthetic development the order of apprehension is reversed. We are apprehended first of all by the mystery of Christianity in the form of the Church. Then, apprehending that by which we are apprehended, we come to a consciousness of our saving relation to the Triune God.

Thus, when the Church gives to those who "truly repent of their sins, and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, with full purpose of new obedience, the comforting assurance that their sins are forgiven in heaven," it is most natural to receive the comfort, and most unnatural to reject it.

It is conceded that when a man sins against his brother, or against nature, he sins against God. When forgiveness comes, why then should it not come from God, through the natural and the human? This is the very order of the Gospel: God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, and Christ, by the Spirit, in humanity, or in His mystical body, saying in an audible human voice to every living member thereof: "Thy sins are pardoned; God is reconciled to thee; thou art his child, and an heir of heaven."

ART. V.—THE LATE UNION MOVEMENT OF THE TWO REFORMED CHURCHES.

REV. FRANKLIN K. LEVAN, A. M., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

THE General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, convened in Cincinnati, Ohio, in November, 1872, passed the following action:

The committee to whom were referred the several documents relating to a closer union with the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, together with the formal request of the delegate from the General Synod of that body, asking for an expression of the views of this Synod on this subject, would report:

That this question has been before the mind of the Church for several years, and thoroughly discussed in all its bearings, and the conclusions reached have found utterance in the action of several Church Courts. The General Synod at Philadelphia, in 1869, had already said that a closer union between the two bodies, so intimately related in doctrine, cultus and name, would be both natural and desirable, so soon as the consummation could be reached with the cordial consent of both parties. It is believed that the action of our Church Courts is not only in harmony with the common feeling of Protestant Christendom regarding the necessity for union in the body of Christ, but it is further held that it is expressive of the sincere desire of the Church which the General Synod represents; that it would be a matter of rejoicing throughout its congregations to be brought into the closest relations for which the providence of the great Head of the Church may prepare the way. The union of these two members of the Reformed Church would realize the accomplishment of a hope long cherished. Under this view, your Committee propose the following as the action of this General Synod:

Resolved, That this General Synod is in full accord with the prevailing sentiment in the Church as it regards the desirableness of Christian unity, and looks forward with pleasure to a union with the Reformed Church in America, that may be accomplished on a basis satisfactory to both Churches. Believing the time to be at hand when negotiations looking to this end should be initiated, it is resolved, by the General Synod, to appoint a committee of three from each of the five Synods comprising the General Synod, who shall confer with a like committee of the Reformed Church in America, on the proposed union between that Church and our own, and report the results of their conference to the General Synod at its next meeting.

After the adoption of the report this other resolution was added:

Resolved, That all the Synods represented in this General Synod, at the ensuing annual meetings, appoint the committees named in the report of the Committee on the Question of Union with the Reformed Church in America.

In accordance with the request of the last resolution, the several District Synods appointed three members to the general committee on the part of the Church. The Reformed Church in America had meanwhile also appointed a committee on the proposed union of the two Reformed Churches. After a long delay, the respective chairmen agreed upon Wednesday morning, November 18th, 1874, as the time, and the First Reformed Church, Race street, Philadelphia, as the place for holding the sessions of the two general committees.

The representation from the Reformed Church in the United States was full, with the exception of one member. Those present were:

Synod in the United States.—Rev. Dr. E. V. Gerhart, Rev. Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger, and Elder Levi Fluck.

The Ohio Synod.—Rev. Dr. I. H. Reiter, Rev. Dr. Samuel Mease, and Rev. Dr. G. W. Williard.

The Northwestern Synod.—Rev. Dr. H. J. Ruetenik, and Rev. S. N. L. Kessler.

The Pittsburgh Synod.—Rev. Dr. G. B. Russell, Rev. J. I. Swander, and Rev. Franklin K. Levan.

The Synod of the Potomac.—Rev. Dr. J. O. Miller, Rev. E. R. Eschbach, and Elder Israel Laucks.

Of a committee of eighteen on the part of the Reformed Church in America, the following members were present:

Rev. Dr. H. D. Ganse, Rev. Dr. A. B. Van Zandt, Rev. Dr. Philip Peltz, Rev. Dr. W. R. Gordon, Rev. Dr. W. J. R. Taylor, Rev. Dr. P. D. Van Cleef, Rev. Dr. E. I. Corwin, and Elders Jonathan Sturgis and R. H. Pruyn.

On Tuesday evening previous, Nov. 17, the committee of the

German Church met in the Race street church for preliminary organization and consultation. The Rev. Dr E. V. Gerhart was elected chairman, and the Rev. Dr. I. H. Reiter, secretary. The roll was called and almost the entire committee found present. The chairman stated the object of the meeting, and had the action of the General Synod on the subject of union with the Dutch Church (already quoted) read. A very free and interesting interchange of opinion was had. It was felt, and repeatedly stated, that the sentiment of the Church on the subject should be given full expression and force in our consultation, and that the personal views of individual members of the committee should either be held in abeyance or be allowed as of simply secondary importance. In this way, as every section was represented, a comparatively clear and complete understanding was reached.

Preliminary to the discussion of particulars, was the question, *Is the Reformed Church in the United States favorable to a union with the Reformed Church in America, and is it disposed to enter upon the work of consummating it on a basis just to both bodies?*

As reasons for an affirmative answer to the question in this broad form we had:

The highly favorable action, unanimously taken, of the General Synod at Cincinnati.

The ready election of members of our committee by the several Synods.

The singularly concurrent testimony from all parts of the Church, expressed in the committee.

Obviously the conclusion reached could only be to enter the joint committee, on the next day, with the intent of going a long way, on our side, toward bringing about the union of the two churches. No formal resolution was offered, or vote taken. The general sense was abundantly apparent without that. It may be added, that there was even some enthusiasm cropping out. Not a jarring word against union was said; and all favorable facts found full response.

Which of the two Churches originated the present movement for their union? Which took the initiatory official steps? The question came to claim attention in this wise. While the committee was engaged in the act of organizing itself, the Rev. Dr. Bomberger remarked that it might be best to place a Western man, say Rev. Dr. Williard or Rev. Dr. Reiter, into the chair, inasmuch as this movement for union had had its origin in that part of our Church, and prominent men from that section were, therefore, likely to be better acquainted with its status and bearings than the brethren from elsewhere. Later in the evening, the writer of this article called attention to the remark, in so far as it implied that the present union movement had its official beginning in the Reformed Church in the United States. He pressed two points:

1. That it was of prime account for the committee to make it clear to itself as to which of the two denominations took the initiative. If the German Church had first overtured the Dutch Church, then it was proper that we of the German Church should approach our Dutch brethren with the offer of liberal terms of union; and in that case also, our responsibility in declining what might seem right and just terms, should we do so, would be largely increased: while, on the other hand, if the Reformed Dutch Church had made the first official overtures, then we ought to look to their committee for the offer of the like terms, and leave with it the greater responsibility in furthering or defeating the movement.

2. That the Reformed Church in America, and not the Reformed Church in the United States, had, in fact, taken the first official steps in the present effort toward union on the part of the two bodies. The following proofs, held to be conclusive on this point, were referred to. We shall insert them in full here, since many of our readers are probably not as familiar with them as the members of the committee were.

a. First, in the order of time, comes the action taken by the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church in a session at Albany, New York, May, 1871. It reads as follows:

"WHEREAS, The corresponding delegate from the Synod of Ohio, of the Reformed Church of the United States, has urgently presented the importance and value of organization between the Reformed Church in America and that Synod;* therefore,

---

*The delegate from our District Synod of Ohio, referred to in the foregoing preamble, was the Rev. Dr. I. H. Reiter. He had no instructions to inaugurate measures for a formal union, either on the part of his Synod or his Church, with the venerable body to which he was delegated. When taking leave, he made a fraternal address, and referred, as has been the custom for years past, to the

"*Resolved*, That this Synod is ever ready to receive to it all those Churches which embrace the blessed faith of the Reformation as expressed in our standards.

"*Resolved*, That the Rev. Philip Peltz be appointed, in connection with our delegate to the Synod of Ohio, to visit that Synod at its next annual session, to state the aspects of the subject of union which strike this Synod, and receive any communication which our brethren may choose to present to us.

"*Resolved*, That our hearts likewise turn warmly toward our brethren of the Reformed faith in the Classis of North Carolina: that we rejoice that the difficulties which prevented our following the desires of our hearts when their proposals were made in 1855 have been removed.*

"*Resolved*, That the Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions, Rev. H. D. Ganse, and Elder S. B. Schieffelin be a committee to present the subject of union to our brethren in the Classis of North Carolina, by corresponding with them or visiting them."

Notice was naturally taken of this third resolution by the Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States at its annual meeting in Pottstown, Pa., October, 1871. The following action was passed:

In view of the fact, that the Classis of North Carolina is an integral part of this Synod, and at no time has been recognized as occupying an independent position, your committee regards the action under consideration, as a manifestation of discourtesy toward this Synod, and a course which, if generally pursued, must eventuate in endless confusion and absolute disintegration of ecclesiastical organization. Inasmuch, however, as the accredited representative (Rev. William H. Ten Eyck, D. D.) of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, assured this body, that the ac-

---

intimate relationship of the two Reformed Churches, and the importance of a closer union between them. This version, in substance, of his mission and action in the case, Dr. Reiter explicitly corroborated in the committee. Officially he did do, and could do, nothing more.

*The reference is to action taken by the Classis of North Carolina (then belonging to the Old Eastern Synod, now to the Synod of the Potomac) of the Reformed Church in the United States. The "proposals made in 1855" were the work of a few restless spirits among the ministry of that venerable Classis, who, however, have since then bethought themselves of better ways. As to the "difficulties" which prevented the Dutch brethren from following the desires of their hearts, they were at least twofold. Those impliedly referred to were the existence of slavery in North Carolina in 1855, and the holding of slaves by some of the Reformed members there. A still more formidable difficulty, (not implied in the resolution, for it was not removed,) lay in the unflinching loyalty of the great mass of the Reformed membership, and a number of its ministry in North Carolina, to the Reformed Church of their forefathers.

tion complained of was taken without proper understanding of the relation subsisting between the Classis of North Carolina and this Synod, and utterly disavowed any predatory intentions on the part of the Synod he represented, declaring that the error committed was an "error of the head and not of the heart," your committee believes, that no special action is called for at this time.

b. The second official step was taken by the Ohio Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, in session at Canton, Ohio, May, 1872. We quote from the published minutes, pp. 16 and 17:

On the morning of the third day of the sessions, the Rev. Edward P. Livingston, delegate from the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, appeared in Synod, and having presented his credentials, took his seat as a corresponding member. He subsequently addressed the Synod in an appropriate and fraternal manner. His address was cordially and properly responded to by the President.

In connection with the delegate, the Rev. Philip Peltz, D. D. appeared as a commissioner from that body to this Synod, and after presenting his credentials, and laying on the table of Synod a copy of the minutes of the body he represented, stated in a written address "the aspects of the subject of union which strike their Synod."

Thereupon, on motion, it was

Resolved, That a committee of one Minister and one Elder from each Classis represented be appointed, to whom the whole subject of union between our Church and the Reformed Church in America, together with all documents pertaining thereto, be referred.

The committee consists of Revs. S. Mease, C. W. Hoyman, Dr. S. B. Leiter, Dr. G. W. Williard, Dr. J. G. Zahner, H. Wilson, C. Cort, G. M. Albright, and Elders B. Kuhns, P. H. King, L. Keller, Dr. C. J. Geiger, F. Bolender and J. Greenameier.

This committee subsequently submitted the following report, which was received, amended, and adopted:

The committee to whom was referred the subject of union between the Reformed Church in America and the Reformed Church in the United States, submit the following report:

That the Synod has heard with pleasure the Rev. Philip Peltz, D. D., who was appointed by the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, held at Albany, N. Y., in June, 1871, a special commissioner, in connection with its delegate, the Rev. Edward P. Livingston, to state to this body the aspect of union as it presented itself to their Synod. Having heard the commissioner, we would say in return, that we regard the union of these two branches of the Church as most important for our common Reformed faith as maintained in our venerable symbol, the Heidelberg Catechism, and that we are ready to co-operate in any and all measures calculated to secure this desirable end, which we believe to be in conformity with the prayer of the great Head of the Church, the spirit of our holy religion, and the wish of all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.

The Synod is also entirely satisfied with the Christian spirit and sincerity of our brethren of the Reformed Church in America touching the movement, especially since it is assured by the worthy commissioner that the Synod of Albany had no design to ignore or show disrespect to any Judicatory of our Church, and that the action assumed the shape it did because they were not able at the time to ascertain the exact relation of our District Synods to the General Synod, as our delegate had left before the action was taken. That the movement did not start with the General Synod, is no just reason why it should not be fairly considered in all its aspects, and meet with a hearty co-operation for a satisfactory termination.

Being thus relieved of the difficulties which some supposed to exist at first, and seeing how the Lord seems to be moving the different portions of the Church to seek a closer union, it is believed that the present movement is under His direction, and should be cordially seconded; therefore,

Resolved, That the subject of union, as presented by our brethren of the Reformed Church in America, be referred to our General Synod for its consideration at its approaching meeting at Cincinnati, Ohio.

Resolved, That the delegate from this Synod to the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America be instructed to lay this action before that body with proper explanations, and request the appointment of a commissioner to our General Synod, with the view of furthering the object of union.

Resolved, That the union here contemplated meets with the cordial favor and approval of this Synod, and that it earnestly requests the General Synod to adopt such measures as will be calculated to effect it as early as possible, upon such a basis as will be just and and honorable to all concerned.

Resolved, That we request the North-western Synod to consider the question of union between the two Churches, and that if it meet their favor, they unite with us in overturing our General Synod to this end.

c. Then, in the third place, came the action (quoted at the beginning of this article) of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, in session at Cincinnati, O., November, 1872. Though having in no sense originated this union movement, it fell in heartily with it, and took efficient measures to further it.

First Session of the Joint Committee.

On Wednesday morning the committees of the two churches met at the place and hour appointed. After the exchange of very friendly greetings on the part of the members, the session was opened under the joint presidency of the chairmen of the two committees, the Rev. Dr. Gerhart and the Rev. Dr. Ganse; the Rev. Dr. Reiter and the Rev. Dr. Corwin being the secretaries. It was agreed, at the suggestion of Rev. Dr. Ganse, that the morning session be spent in free mutual conference on the principal characteristics, laws and customs of the two churches. This looked like a sort of introduction, very useful in its way, to the definite work the committees had been commissioned to do. Quite a number of points were discussed; many important facts brought out, much brotherly feeling shown. The best of spirit prevailed. It was difficult to stop. Among the points and facts developed, the following are probably of most account. We give them as near in the language of notes, taken at the time, as we can:

The Reformed Church in the United States holds as its Confessional Standard only the Heidelberg Catechism.

Question: Does it gives the Catechism its interpretation from the Calvinistic or the Arminian point of view on the matters in dispute between these two types of thought?

Answer: The Catechism is German in its origin, and does not, in any direct way, grow out of the controversy on predestination and free will. It is held, therefore, that it is not primarily concerned about either view, and makes no formal or final decision either way. It is Calvinistic rather than Arminian in its general structure, and is interpreted as being far broader than Calvinism on the decrees and kindred subjects.

Question: Would a candidate for the ministry in the Reformed Church in the United States be specially examined on the doctrine of predestination? Would he be rejected for holding Arminian views? Is a large proportion of its ministers Arminian?

Answer: He would probably not be specially examined on the doctrine of predestination; though, the matter being free, there is great diversity in practice in the different Classes and Synods. His holding either Calvinistic or Arminian views would be no cause in itself for his rejection. Some of the ministers are, doubtless, strict Calvinists respecting the decrees; others are Arminian; the great majority, probably, occupy a stand-point which seeks to combine the truths underlying the doctrines of predestination and free-will, in a higher unity.

Question: Would a minister coming from the Reformed Church in America, presumably a strict Calvinist, and having a regular call from a congregation of the Reformed Church in the United States, be received on the strength of his certificate of honorable dismission from the former body?

Answer: He would. The fact that the two bodies are in friendly official correspondence with each other would determine that matter.

The Reformed Church in America holds as its confessional standards the Heidelberg Catechism, the Belgic Confession and the Articles of the Synod of Dort.

Question. Are these standards of equal authority? and is the Church strictly Calvinistic on the doctrine of Predestination?

Answer: They are of equal authority; and the Church is strictly Calvinistic, though not in the supra-lapsarian sense.

Question: Do candidates for the ministry have to subscribe the three formulas?

Answer: They do.

Question: Given, the case of a minister of the Reformed Church in the United States, regularly dismissed, and having a proper call from a congregation of the Reformed Church in America, would he be received into the latter body on the strength of his certificate of honorable dismissal from the former?

Answer: He would not. It would be required of him, as of all ministers, to subscribe a formula binding him to the three standards.

In the Reformed Church in the United States, the baptized children, as they come to years of maturity, are gathered into catechetical classes, and instructed in the doctrines of Christianity according to the Catechism, (which they commit to memory,) for a period of from four months to a year, as circumstances allow. Those who then apply for confirmation, being approved by the consistory, are confirmed, and admitted to the Holy Communion. Confirmation also invests them with the full rights of membership.

In the Reformed Church in America, the pastor preaches on the Catechism once every Lord's day in the year, as a rule. Catechetical classes, in the sense in which they are found in the other Church, are not formed. The youth of the Church are received into full membership by public announcement of their names, after an approved examination by the consistory.

In the Reformed Church in the United States, several Liturgies, or Orders of Worship, are in use. The extent of their use is left free with the proper authorities of the congregations. They are expected to be used in the case of baptisms, communions, church-festivals and special occasions generally. As a rule, congregations employ an Order of Worship to such extent as they deem most conducive to edification in their particular cases.

In the Reformed Church in America, the old Palatinate Liturgy, altered to suit, is in use. Free worship, so-called, is the rule in congregations; except on specified occasions and for specified acts, when the use of the Liturgy is obligatory upon all.

Other matters discussed are sufficiently referred to in the report of the sub-committee, adopted at the close of Thursday morning's session. It was in the afternoon's session of Wednesday that the statements with respect to Liturgies, above given in substance, were principally made.

It being already past mid-day, the joint committee resolved to adjourn until 3 o'clock. It was also agreed that the Committees of the two Churches should meet separately, from two to three o'clock, in order that each might consult by itself as to what it deemed best to do.

Session of the Committee of the Reformed Church in the U. S.

At the appointed hour, the two committees assembled in the rooms respectively assigned them by the kindness of Rev. Dr. Nevin, pastor of the church. We can, of course, give no account of the proceedings of the committee of the Reformed Church in America, while in separate session. We give an outline of those of the Reformed Church in the United States.

In the first place the feeling seemed to be general that a union of the two Churches was possible. The conference of the morning was assumed to have developed no insuperable difficulties, provided each body was willing to allow generous liberty to the other, yea, guarantee it until time should bring about such conformity, in matters on which differences now exist, as might be desirable; absolute uniformity in a large ecclesiastical body being neither possible nor desirable. The conference was supposed to have made the call for a union clearer: the question whether the requisite will and wisdom to make it real were at hand in the two bodies, was undetermined. No wild enthusiasm was manifest. There were, however, unmistakably shown a desire and determination on the part of the committee to come up fully, as far as ability and knowledge were given, to the demands of the occasion.

It was agreed that our committee should await an offer of terms of union from the other committee, inasmuch as the Reformed Church in America had officially initiated the movement. It was further agreed to go into a consideration of the entire subject, on the basis of whatever propositions the other committee might offer, in case it should offer any.

But our committee must also come to an understanding of what it, and through it the Church it represented, was willing to do, toward what end it would seek to bring the discussion in joint committee, in so far as it at present comprehended the subject. Not to enter the conference at sea as to what it thought best to be done, or as to what course to take in it, it had to answer to itself, measurably, at least, the question: *What terms of union ought to be adopted, just to the peculiarities and life of both Churches, and admitting of their living together peaceably and working harmoniously under one general organization.* These terms, indeed, could only be an outline, subject to large alteration; but still an outline showing the direction to be taken. A very general statement of views on the part of members of the committee took place. Singular unanimity in the main was manifest. After nearly all the members had spoken, some of them twice, Rev. Dr. Russell summed up the apparent sense of the committee in a brief, forcible manner, in a speech strongly favorable to union.

The time for action having come, and seeing the conclusion which he himself had reached so fully expressed on every side, the writer of this article submitted, as substantially a basis for our action, a paper which he had drawn up after the morning conference of the joint-committee. It met with great favor. Immediately after its reading, the Rev. Dr. Williard moved its adoption by our committee. The motion was seconded by several members, among them, if we remember correctly, Drs. Reiter and Mease.

The Rev. Dr. Bomberger remarked that, owing to other important duties, he had not given the subject of union the attention he otherwise would; that he was not just clear as to what was best, but thought the paper submitted did not lodge sufficient authority in the General Synod under an organic union.

Rev. Dr. Williard replied by calling for a second reading of the paper, and directing attention to the fact that, except on the matters fundamentally reserved—reserved equally in the interest of each Church—the General Synod would have most ample powers.

On being called upon, the author of the paper corroborated this view as that intended to be expressed by the paper, adding that deficiencies on any point would naturally be corrected in joint committee, if it came to discussion and action there.

Rev. Drs. Miller, Reiter, Mease, and others, expressed themselves as favorable to the motion.

Rev. Dr. Gerhart thought it might be well if the theological status of the two Churches, on living issues now confronting the Christian world, were subjected to friendly and frank discussion in joint committee, before direct action on union took place. He would, however, not go counter to the course of the committee, but give it his support.

The Rev. Dr. Corwin, secretary of the other committee, came and announced that it was now ready for the joint session.

The motion to adopt the paper was then unanimously agreed to, and the committee adjourned.

Session of the Joint Committee in the Afternoon.

Upon the re-assembling of the joint committee, the question was asked whether the committee of either Church had any special communication to make as the result of its separate session.

The chairman of the committee on the part of the Reformed Church in America said that his committee had come to no definite conclusion, and hence had no formal terms of union, so far as it was concerned, to submit. As individuals, they thought it might be well to resume the friendly conference so profitably carried forward in the morning, and so turn the remainder of the day to good account. However, if the committee on the part of the Reformed Church in the United States had any conclusions, reached by them to submit, his committee would be pleased to hear them.

The chairman of our committee now stated that it had, with great unanimity, come to two main conclusions:

1. That if the other committee made offer of any plan or terms of union, we would accept the same as the basis for the discussion of the question in its various bearings.

2. In case the other committee should not submit any such plan or terms, then it would submit a paper, upon which it had agreed, as the basis for discussing the question of union between the two Churches.

The chairman of the other committee replied that, as his committee had resolved upon nothing definite, and hence had nothing definite to offer, it was ready to hear our statement.

The reading of the basis of union, adopted by our committee, was now called for. Before it was read, the chairman distinctly called attention to its character as an outline basis, indicating our way of thinking on the subject; adding that if it should be the pleasure of the other committee to agree to a discussion of the general question under it, we would be quite willing to join in altering its terms, as the common good would seem to demand it. Rev. Dr. Bomberger made explanations of similar character. The author of the paper stated that it was somewhat hastily drawn up, with the expectation, now unfulfilled, of its being carefully revised, which accounted for its synoptical form.

The paper was read. The following is a verbatim copy of the original:

1. *Organic union.*

2. *Heidelberg Catechism, the common standard.*

3. *The Belgic Confession, the Articles of Dort, of great historical importance to the whole Reformed Church, and of authority next to the Heidelberg Catechism.*

4. *One General Synod. Powers limited, and defined.*

5. *No existing rights of District Synods or Classes to be interfered with in either body.*

6. *The status of colleges, theological seminaries, orphan homes, liturgies, orders of worship, hymn books, publication interests, to remain unaffected by this union.*

7. *Church cultus and customs, including confirmation, to be left free to the congregations of each body as now.*

These things to be fundamentally and absolutely reserved from all legislation by the General Synod.

The General Synod may establish theological and other institutions, or publishing interests, publish an order of worship or hymn book, but with no power to exclude any such now existing, or to be called into existence, by rights now inhering in Synods and Classes of either of the contracting parties.

A long pause followed. The critical moment had come. The test of professions and efforts, running through several years, was at hand. The committee on the part of the Reformed Church in the United States had now made its statement, shown its willingness to enter upon positive negotiations for union, and offered what all most probably will concede, (unless the doctrine of predestination is to be accepted even in our day as controlling in Christian theology,) a liberal basis for such negotiations. It appeared to many of us as if the other committee had not expected the harmonious agreement on our side. Reports had been set afloat, affirming that a majority of our committee were not favorable to a union of the two Churches; they were even whispered into the ears of the *Tribune* reporter during the sessions. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The solitary member of our committee who claimed to be "confused" on the subject, to use his own expression, was the one who would likely be supposed most anxious for the union. Yet he appreciated the generous zeal of his committee, and went with it. To whatever extent, if any, our Dutch brethren had given ear to the reports in question, they must now have seen to what unwise and misinformed prophets they had listened. Be this as it may, the offer made seemed to come like the unannounced arrival of a guest, whom it is a matter of equal delicacy to bid leave or stay.

The first to break the somewhat painful suspense was the Rev. Dr. Van Zandt, professor in the theological seminary at New Brunswick. He said, in substance, he could not speak for the other members of the committee of the Reformed Church in America. He must, in the main, confine himself to his own views. The paper offered would not bring a satisfactory union; nor did he see how such a one could be reached. The present union feeling in Protestant Christendom was largely an epidemic. It was a popular thing, and men ran wild in its behalf. There was probably not as much wisdom underlying it as it had popularity. It would abate by and by. The Protestant denominations had gotten along well heretofore. So had the the two Reformed Churches. They had served the Master in their separate organizations, and had made themselves a blessing to men. Why should they not continue in the same course? He could see no good reason; none, especially, that would make union between them imperative. They, of his committee, had also heard that there were divisions among the brethren of the other Church, and they naturally would rather not be a party to them. His advice, therefore, was that both bodies should rest satisfied with the existing relations between them, until God should in His wise providence make a different course clearly manifest.

Rev. Dr. Gordon held that the two Churches were not prepared for an organic union. There must first be oneness of doctrine. Other matters, as government and cultus, could be arranged, he supposed. But, in his view, there was not the same apprehension of the doctrines of grace in the two bodies which were to be parties to this union. That was fatal. The German Church held the Heidelberg Catechism simply as its confession; the Dutch Church, this Catechism in connection with the Belgic Confession and the Canons of Dort. Hence the difficulty. The doctrines of grace are not looked at just in the same way. In fact, there is a far reaching difference. He was, of course, only giving his own view; but so it appeared to him.

Rev. Dr. Taylor alluded to other obstacles in the way of an organic union of two such old, well-established churches. There were property interests, endowments, chartered rights. Customs, modes of thought, forms of worship, were not just the same. Organic union would require the German Church to add two Confessions to the one it now has; or his Church either to drop or give a secondary position, as proposed in the paper offered, to two of its honored standards. He would not say that a solution of these difficulties could not be reached; but it would take time.

The members of the committee of the Reformed Church in America had spoken frankly, definitely. Ours had simply listened. The union movement was at an end. What now to do was not so clear. Our committee felt somewhat sore. There was no mistaking that. There was good reason for it. It felt that the Reformed Church in the United States had not been dealt with in a very desirable way, from the inception of this movement at Albany, in the spring of 1872, until now, if such was the state of mind in which, at bottom, the other Church stood toward it. That Church had a perfect right to its way of thinking cheerfully accorded; but that way of thinking, it was now evident made union, from the very start, impossible.

Parenthetically it may be remarked that both Churches, doubtless, felt the force of many and strong reasons why a union between them should be effected. In the case of each Church there were, however, also specific reasons which weighed with it against such union. By the Reformed Church in America, these latter were allowed the ascendancy. By the Reformed Church in the United States, they were subordinated to the greater good which it was hoped the union would secure.

The following seemed to be leading difficulties in the mind of the Dutch Church:

1. It felt itself unable to give the Belgic Confession and the Canons of Dort a secondary confessional position, the inevitable necessity for which, in the event of a union, was fully appreciated. If we mistake not, one of the members of the committee remarked that such a proposition would scarcely get two votes in the General Synod, he supposed.

2. It feared that the other Church was largely and necessarily influenced by its manifold relations to Lutheranism, past and present: this, moreover, to a greater extent than it was willing to assent to.

3. Various changes, of more or less importance, would inevitably come. These it did not feel inclined to invite.

4. The so-called Mercersburg Theology was not to its mind. And as this would have been an active factor in the united body, it deemed it judicious to keep clear of it.

The most prominent difficulties weighing in the mind of the German Church were substantially these:

1. Being mainly a German body as to its origin, it naturally felt that the Belgic Confession and the Canons of Dort, even when assigned a secondary position, but backed by so active and intelligent a people as our Dutch brethren, would still be an uncomfortble element in the united body.

2. The strong inclination, so repeatedly shown for a few years past, and to the very moment of the meeting of the joint committee, by the Reformed Church in America, to coalesce, in one form or another, with the American Presbyterian Church, it was feared would become a source of trouble. The general conviction in the Reformed Church in the United States seems to be, that the Reformed Church, distinctively so called, has a very great deal of practical and theoretical work to do, on its own broad, historical basis, before it can afford to involve itself in the complications which any probable coalescing process with that body would of necessity involve.

3. A third difficulty lay at home. There is a large, European-born, German element in the Reformed Church in the United States. It is rapidly growing, and has every prospect of continuous growth. With the best will on its part, and with equally the best will on the part of the English-speaking element, the majority now in the Church, some friction will occasionally occur, generally growing out of the question of language: this when the two are allied as closely as kinship can be. Under the union, the disparity of numbers with regard to language would be much greater, the average kinship (if the expression be allowed) less close, and occasional friction, or whatever one may please to call it, far more likely. The English-speaking element would obtain such an overwhelming majority, that only by the exercise of the utmost discretion, it could deal justly with its German-speaking brethren.

But to resume. When the Rev. Dr. Taylor had concluded his speech, and it had become evident that the other side was looked to for an expression of its views of the case as it now stood, the Rev. Dr. Russell rose. He expressed his disappointment and regret at the course this union movement had taken, and concluded by offering a resolution declaring the labor of the joint committee ended, and looking to an immediate adjournment. After further remarks from different members of both committees, this resolution was withdrawn, to make room for another, offered at the suggestion of Rev. Dr. Ganse. It provided for the appointment of a subcommittee, consisting of three members from each Church, with instructions to draw up a paper, carefully stating the results of the Conference, in proper form for submission to the General Synods of the two Churches, and repo rt the same for adoption at a specia session of the joint committee the next morning. This resolution was adopted. The members of the sub-committee were;

Reformed Church in America.—Rev. Drs. Ganse, Van Zandt, and Taylor.

Reformed Church in the United States.—Rev. Drs. Gerhart, Miller, and Bomberger.

The report of this committee, as it was subsequently unanimously adopted, is herewith appended:

The Committees of Conference appointed by the General Synods of the Reformed Church in the United States and the Reformed Church in America, met in Philadelphia on the morning of Nov. 18, 1874, and spent in joint sessions the greater part of that and the succeeding day. After a very free and brotherly interchange of information concerning the organization, symbols, doctrinal sentiments and usages of the two denominations, the committees agreed upon the following statement of the results of their conference:

1. Such large and obvious elements of likeness and sympathy as exist between the two bodies seem to point very plainly to some ultimate union between them. They are almost identical in name, as in origin and in early history. Their ecclesiastical organization and nomenclature of consistory, classis, synod, and general synod, are substantially the same. One venerable symbol, the Heidelberg Catechism, is held in common by the two denominations. The body of doctrine which either Church derives from this common symbol of necessity have close and fundamental resemblances. The committee have found, moreover, a perfect unity of method and spirit in the devotional acts which they have performed together, and their whole interview has reminded them of the essential unity of their work of caring for those continental Christians of the Reformed faith who are so widely distributed over the newer parts of our country. With these and similar points of contact between the two bodies, the committee cannot believe that they will abide apart.

2. The committees have further found with gratification that some elements of seeming difference between their two denomina-

tions have, upon fuller information concerning them, lost much of their apparent importance. In particular, the usage of confirmation prevails in the Reformed Church in the United States and is unknown in the Reformed Church of North America; but as it is interpreted in the constitution of the first-named Church, it is plain that it may fully consist with the principles and methods by which the other Church admits her baptized youth to full communion. It does not appear therefore that the continuance of that usage on one side or the abstinence from it on the other, ought to be a decisive obstacle to union. The observance of festal religious days in the Reformed Church in the United States, though very general, is not enjoined, and therefore stands upon the same footing with the same observance as it prevails, though to a less extent, in the Reformed Church in America. Even such divergences as may exist in the matter of liturgical services, so long as they might not be seen to turn upon important differences of doctrinal belief, might be harmoniously adjusted. The Committee, indeed, have little doubt that all the minor elements of difference which have grown up in the two Churches during their separate life could either be softened or accommodated in a cordial and intelligent attempt to bring these Reformed Churches under a single banner.

3. The committees, however, are constrained to say that some other obstacles to union seem to be of a less manageable character. The most patent of these lies in the fact that while both of these denominations accept the Heidelberg Catechism, the Reformed Church in America adds to this symbol the Belgic Confession and the Canons of the Synod of Dort. In order, therefore, to an organic union of the two bodies, the one or the other would be compelled to make a material change in its doctrinal standards. Since neither committee feels prepared to advise its Synod to make so important a concession, they can only agree in making a frank statement of this difficulty, in the hope that time and the best wisdom of the two denominations, and, above all, the providence of God, may direct to its final solution. In addition to this, the probable fact that a body made up of these two denominations would include important differences in doctrinal views and ecclesiastical feeling, has appeared during the conference. These obstacles seem to preclude any further present negotiations in the direction of organic union. The committees, in conclusion, are fully persuaded that although their interview has developed no plan or distinct prospect of the organic union of their two Churches, a real advance toward that most desirable result has been made in the frank and friendly conference which has now been held. The difficulty of merging denominations so old and so well established could not be expected to be small. It is something gained to be able to see at what point the obstacles are greatest. Not less valuable is that cultiva-

tion of brotherly acquaintance, esteem, and sympathy which the conference has greatly furthered. The ultimate issue of their interview the committee intrust to Christ, the one Head of the one Universal Church, in the faith that He has kindled in these sister denominations the desire of union, and that He will not suffer the desire to fail.

ART. VI.—HUMAN LIABILITY TO ERROR.

PROF. GEO. N. ABBOTT.

Somewhere it has been set down as the advice of Benjamin Franklin, that, instead of saying, "It is so and so," one should better say, "It seems to me to be so and so."

Although this advice is said to have been given with primary reference to the promotion of modesty of assertion, yet there may be in it at least an indirect recognition of a principle of philosophy which has for some time been receiving large attention on the part of certain thinkers, and which now seems to be unsettling the objective certainty of much that has long passed for immovable truth. If, in times past, a person whose faith-faculty was too little developed has been characterized as one who would not believe any further than he could see, the range of incredulity is vastly widened now, when colors, sounds, and even, according to some, the forms of objects are only translations of certain nervous affections to suit our mode of ideation; what nature does in each case being as different from the perceptions occasioned in our minds as the clicks of the telegraph are from the thoughts which pass through the practiced listener's mind while he hears them.

No longer are there really red, blue, or purple objects, except so far as a certain reflex activity of the subject sends back, from a manufactory within, the tissue it has woven out of successive undulations coming from without; the colors being more or less vivid or distinct, according as the manufacturing process is more or less perfect. To use a vulgar phraseology, the seeming colored object is "all in our eye;"* or, since we may no longer assert with assurance that there is even an image formed on the retina, the colored object may be several degrees more subjective than if it were in the eye. Again, in the case of hearing, it would seem that the translations and transformations between the objective cause and the subjective effect are as numerous and great as if one should deliver a verbal message to a telegrapher, the latter should translate it into rhythmically determined motions of his key, the message again appearing in a succession of lines and dots, and finally reaching its destination in the form of ordinary manuscript; the last being all that the recipient has any direct cognizance of.

As regards the sense-world, then, we are almost forced into the position which Socrates, in his modesty, voluntarily took when he condensed his entire pretension to wisdom into a simple assertion that he knew nothing, except the bare fact that he knew nothing. There is, no doubt, a world of objective truth and reality; so there is a sphere of subjective truth; but the difficulty is to draw the line between the two, so as to be able to say, on this side is the ego's representation, and on that side the "thing in itself." That the sweetness or sourness of the apple is in the sensation, and not in the apple, is apparent enough on reflection; though of course the taste is not independent of an objective quality. But when we come to such ideas as bulk, number, figure, motion, and rest of bodies, we arrive at disputed ground; one class of philosophers confidently affirming that these "primary qualities" are really in bodies, whether any one perceive them or not; while others see no reason for making such a distinction in favor of "primary qualities," but offer grave reasons for believing their being (*esse*),

---

*Since the above was written, K. Ch. Planck's "Anthropologie and Psychologie" (Leipsic, 1874) has come to hand; in which the present *subjective* theories of perception are combated. According to the author, there is objective, as well as subjective, truth in vision. So, doubtless, the magnetism *induced* by galvanic electricity exhibits the truth of the electricity; and, were our senses fine enough, we might, perhaps, *perceive* a *phenomenal unity* in what falls under two aspects at present, because our senses are too gross for the higher apprehension.

Now if we think of *color* as a phenomenal effect induced in the sensorium, can we be sure that, in the case, something analogous to the magnetic effect of an electric-cause has not taken place? Speaking cautiously, then, might we not call color *subjective*,—leaving its unity with an objective fact for future discovery?

as well as that of sounds, colors, and flavors, to be their being perceived (*percipi*).

And when we remember that the men of the past and of the present who have maintained these opposite opinions have never been proved to be out of their senses, or intellectually inferior to the very best thinkers, may we not well take Franklin's advice, and say, "it seems to me" that things are, or are not, what they purport to be; in preference to giving some modern Socrates the trouble of showing by a scrutinizing cross-examination that we really know nothing, "but are not aware of the fact."

Again, is the case essentially different with regard to the thought-world from what it is with the sense-world? Is there no difficulty in apprehending the true nature of thought? Is it an easy matter to reconstruct another's thought? Is it the easiest thing for one clearly to know what he thinks himself? A recent editorial passage in one of the prominent journals of the day oracularly announces that "multitudes of people do not think what they think they think." Did the Delphic deity himself ever hit the nail better on the head? There is, no doubt, a tendency towards truth in every genuine effort of human reason; but the determination of a comet's orbit, from a few observations of its position, is a light task, compared with the tracing of the entire movement of a thought from the uncertain glimpses which we may get of it.

As an illustration of the difficulty of determining even a very simple form of thought, we may adduce the fact that no thoroughly satisfactory definition of a straight line has yet been constructed. The definition which says that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points does not seem to furnish any proper method of mental construction;* and an effort to supply this lack has led to the definition: "A straight line is one which has at every point the same direction." But here we seem to be in a circle: for the term *direction* already contains the idea of straightening. If we go back to Euclid's statement that the straight line lies "evenly," or "equally" (*ἐζίσου*), between its extreme points, we do not still get clearly the constructive principle desired. To mention another example,—the writer once heard a discussion on divergent algebraic series, which, resulting unsatisfactorily to one of the parties, led to a correspondence with mathematicians of note, the result being the discovery that different views were held; some mathematicians seeming to imagine that even figures *can* lie, unless duly restrained from too free utterance; while others, having full confidence in all their deliverances, appeared willing to give them the greatest range of freedom.

---

*Possibly the stretching of a cord, so as to make the shortest portion of it extend from point to point, might have suggested this definition.

Now if there is room for difference of opinion in the most clear, exact, and certain of all sciences, what is to be looked for in the nebulous realms of philosophy and theology? Indeed we need not go beyond the most elementary doctrines of logic, a department of philosophy whose sailing-craft, if the figure be allowed, scarcely ever ventures out of sight of land, to find occasion for eager disputation. The question about how much definite, and how much indefinite, meaning there is in an ordinary proposition or judgment, furnishes a bone of contention sufficient to rouse the interests, if not the passions, of the gravest men.

Proceeding on to the border-land between formal logic and concrete philosophy, we find in the controversy between nominalism and realism a "conflict of ages," not even now entirely extinct. But the wars of the gods and the Titans will hardly furnish an adequate similitude to the fearful clashings of metaphysical and theological dogma.

Yet, notwithstanding these conflicts of opinion, there would seem to be some ground for confidence in human reason; whatever view may be taken of the origin of man. If, as the Darwinians would have it, humanity is to be looked upon as the last result of nature's own workings, then ought this last and noblest utterance of nature to be the most truthful one: else would nature herself give the lie to all the assertions of science with regard to her consistency and truthfulness of design. Science itself is but an advanced evolution of reason; and if the spirit of truth be not in science, then does all the boasted development of nature end in a tissue of falsehoods. From such a consummation the scientist's faith in nature must shrink; hence it would seem that an *argumentum ad hominem* might be made out to convict him of inconsistency, in case he denies the significance of man's spiritual instincts. The most he can consistently do in this regard is to assume that those instincts, like other phenomena of nature, have been incorrectly interpreted; and in that view it would become the highest duty of science to set about discovering the true interpretation; for a profound truth there must be in the most exalted manifestation which nature can exhibit, as the result of unnumbered ages of upward progress.

On the other hand, if it be assumed that man is the immediate work of God, there must be ground for believing such a work to possess, at least in the first instance, a truthful nature. If the word of God be true, His works ought to be true also; and if there be a work which is at the same time a word, a work like reason, whose very nature is to radiate in self-utterance, should it not naturally be expected that such utterance would be essentially consistent with the character of the Creator? The doctrine of the fall of man may come in to modify our confidence in the deliverances of human reason; yet it would hardly seem to be accordant with the usual construction of the theory of depravity to assume that even fallen man does, in his inmost soul, feel better *satisfied* with falsehood than with truth. Indeed, some Christian philosophers appear to hold that a consciousness of the good and the true may abide, even where the ability to obey the truth has been perverted. But however much evil inclinations may be supposed to vitiate mental perception, certainly regenerate humanity ought to be not only susceptible to truth, but desirous of it. The regenerate children of the light ought to see eye to eye. But as a matter of fact, where in all history has dissension reigned more triumphantly than amid the professedly regenerate?

The ground for variety of opinion must, it would seem then, be sought in human nature itself, rather than in any particular moral phases of it. If, as appears probable, the ultimate tendency of all genuine thinking is to truth, it may happen that the final destination of thought is not always, or even generally, reached in consciousness; the result, for the time, being in some sense a misjudgment with regard to the proper import of the partially wrought fabric of ideation. The subjects of this incomplete ideation do not really think what they think they think. And who that thinks at all is not a subject of incomplete ideation? Who in all the past has been known to develop, even approximately, the whole truth on any single theme? Who does not find frequent occasion to reconstruct his own theories of former years, or at all events to complement and qualify them?

Evidences are surely not wanting, in nature, of a condition of things in which results apparently untrue to nature's own idea by some means come about, while yet every agency concerned has done its part of the work in hand with full fidelity to law; that is, if the law of its activity be extended, so as to embrace its proper behavior in relation to all other agencies with which it is brought in contact: so that analogy would indicate the probability of mental judgments more or less inconsistent, without involving the notion that reason acts fitfully, and in essential disregard of its proper method. The very light of nature is subject to many aberrations and refractions, though its first law is to move in undeviating lines. By disturbing media it is not only bent out of its course, but changed in its color, or doubly refracted; so that judgments based on its indications will sometimes be very erroneous, as compared with judgments about the same objects looked at under different circumstances. But such variations in the evidence which light gives of objects are, on investigation, found not to result from any freakishness in the light, but from its complete subjection to its own law. Perhaps it is no more to be wondered at, that reason should see things in different lights, than that the eye should see them thus.

Some men, apparently having large faith in reason as such, have seemed to take this view, and have tried to show up the causes, both subjective and outward, for the aberrations of reason. Lord Bacon is said to have classified such causes under the name of "Idols," namely, the "Idols of the Tribe, or the necessary faults and imperfections of the human intellect itself; Idols of the Den, which arise from the special constitution, education, and habits of each individual man; Idols of the Forum, proceeding from the defects of the language which we are obliged to employ as an instrument of thought and means of communication; and Idols of the Theatre, or the various dogmas of ill-founded systems of philosophy, which have found their way into men's minds through tradition, negligence, and credulity."* The quaintness of the designations of the various "idols" should not detract attention from the real significance of the idols themselves.

---

* Bowen's Logic, pp. 37, 38.

Without, however, making the conceptions embodied in these idols the exact molds for our present thoughts, it may be well to attempt some sort of grouping of certain misdirections to which mental activities may be liable.

In order to come at a principle for a first class of mental distortions, reference may be had to what has already been said about the mind's construction of the suggestions of sensation. If it be true that sensation in its first estate only furnishes hints for the constructive intelligence to act upon, it may be readily imagined that the activity of the latter agency will not always be duly proportioned to the occasion furnished by the former. There will be then a certain liability to make either too little or too much out of the promptings of sensation, somewhat as may be done with a *verbal* hint or suggestion. That ordinary perception fails generally to bring to consciousness as much meaning as is implied in the impression of sense, can be easily proved. Any one who has had a little practice in examining unfamiliar objects through a compound microscope may well remember the difficulty which his eye, in its first attempts, met with in giving distinct outline to the object under inspection. In case the object be something familiar, a cluster of printed words in miniature, for instance, there may be no hesitation in the visual perception; but if a fine cell-structure or some network of nature be the object, the strain on the constructive agency will be likely to be much greater. Again, an unpracticed eye will often see little more than paint at least in certain parts of an artist's landscape; while the eye of a connoisseur will at once perceive the whole in distinct perspective, though even the view of the latter will in case of a work of excellence be much improved by prolonged attention.*

How many there are who never behold nature in her beauty, simply because the mind's imaging power is too little active to construct the picture which nature so winningly endeavors to make them realize of her. The difficulty of adequately describing nature becomes very apparent to any one in sympathy with the science of the day, which interests itself so much with minute and accurate observation. A recent critique on Virgil's sea-descriptions contains the remark that "literal description of any and all natural objects is still in a very rudimentary stage." As to that renowned Roman poet, the writer says: "We have to charge it against Virgil that his sea-descriptions are poor—that they are failures. Indeed, we solemnly affirm that he was what might fairly be termed sea-blind."

---

*Dr. W. B. Carpenter (Mental Physiology, pp. 259–60) says: "A mere sketch shall convey to one person a much more accurate notion of the object represented, than a more finished picture shall give to another; because from practice in this kind of mental reconstruction, the former recognizes the true meaning of the sketch, and fills it up in his 'mind's eye;' whilst the latter can see little but what is actually before his bodily vision, and interprets as a literal presentation that which was intended merely as a suggestion."

If we turn from sights to sounds, we find the same difficulty in attaining thorough-going perception. Where the ear with ordinary attention perceives only a single tone, a finer perception discovers a clang, embracing a set of overtones and, it may be, undertones, in addition to the leading note. If two or more notes are struck upon an instrument, the system of overtones and undertones becomes still more complex. In the case, however, of a simple clang from sounding one note, Professor Helmholtz, who is the great authority on this subject, is said to have discovered only overtones; whilst Professor Elsberg, who states this of Helmholtz, claims to "have heard, on several occasions, tones lower in pitch than the fundamental." If, then, the clangs listened to by the two experimenters were not essentially different, it appears that even the most thoroughly scientific attention of a single person is not always sufficient to bring to consciousness the phenomenon in its entireness. Probably continued investigation into the nature of sound will yet reveal numerous facts that have thus far eluded the perception of the keenest listeners.

But sensuous construction fails not merely by defect; it makes also errors, sometimes egregious ones, by way of excess. The constructive fantasy is by fear, great expectation, or other excitement, stimulated to extraordinary activity; so as to produce representations quite out of proportion with the actual sensuous impressions. Many a time the youthful traveler by night sees the animal he has learned most to dread, complete in every part; but only requiring to be assailed with a stone, in order to undergo instant transformation into a rock or stump. The ancients, children as they were in the art of observing nature, have left evidence, not only of a wonderful failure in many cases to grasp the real significance of phenomena, but also of a more wonderful power of exaggeration and false representation. "In the sky of their days were wont to appear all sorts of terrible portents: blood-red moons, armies engaged in battle, and comets which from their horrid hair shook pestilence and war; while the showers of milk, blood, flesh, wool, stones, and burnt bricks, left it impossible to foresee what might not come down unannounced at any moment." The fauna of monsters with which they peopled the earth, the sea, and the air, furnishes evidence of an exaggerating and distorting perception, as well as of a wonder-loving fancy. To be sure there were certain things which the ancients observed carefully and accurately. Their best statuary, so nicely copying the human figure, is one evidence of this fact. But had they possessed the eyes of a modern scientist for all classes of objects, they could not have failed to look out of countenance such creatures as satyrs, hydras, harpies, griffons, and the like.

But sensuous exaggeration did not die with the ancients In the last century, Pontoppidan, bishop of Bergen, is related* to have described the Kraken, which had by others been "confounded with the great sea-serpent," as "not elongated as a serpent, but round, like an island, for which it was commonly mistaken." According to the Norwegian fishermen, the back of the animal is "a mile and a half in circumference, with arms long and large as the masts of a man-of-war."

Think, too, of that maelstrom off the coast of Norway, which in the days of our childhood used to draw into its fearful vortex every thing that ventured within "three miles;" but which now, along with its "illustrious predecessor," Charybdis, has been bereft of all its terrors. Again, the asserted wonders of "spiritualism" might furnish striking examples of overstrained and false perception. That a lady of undoubted veracity, and in full possession of her senses, should relate, among other feats of table-turning, that she had lifted a table from the floor, and whirled it round in the air, by merely applying a single finger to its center on the top, after it was "excited by the circle of sitters placing their hands upon it," would probably be to most persons proof of some sort of overaction of sense-construction; yet the writer once heard such a statement from a person wanting neither the talents nor the education to give her a proper use of the perceptive faculty. Again, the sight of a strong and intelligent man overcome, even to tears, with the belief that he was holding real converse with a deceased friend, through a medium, every one of whose tricks, though ingenious, were transparent enough to a dispassionate observer, is enough to convince one that a great deal too much can be made of a little sense-material. To a similar effect go alleged cases, such as that of a person's being "transported two miles through the air, in a state of trance," lighting at length on a table in a darkened room with "doors and windows securely closed;" or that of a man's "floating from an open window of one room into an open window of another at a height of seventy-five feet above the ground."*

---

*In an Article on the "Fauna of Fancy."

Other dominant ideas than those of spiritualism may occasion a misinterpretation of sense-data; as is illustrated by a case in which, a Crystal Palace containing animals being on fire, and the chimpanzee being *supposed* to have escaped from his cage, the lookers-on, possessed with the idea of this escape, were attracted to the roof, and "saw the unhappy animal holding on to it, and writhing in agony to get astride one of the iron ribs;" when in fact they were only throwing away their sympathies upon a "tattered piece of blind, so torn as to resemble, to the eye of fancy, the body, arms and legs of an ape."†

Just as the last sentence was finished, there was related to the writer an experience of hearing, during a walk in the street, a very "clear and musical note of a new and unknown bird," the charm of which was shortly dispelled by the discovery, a little further on, that the sound came from a "hideously creaking gate." The *imagined* and the *known* sources of the sound made thus much of difference in its quality; an apt illustration of the criteria by which sentiments are judged according to their origin.

On the whole, then, it would seem that there is a very great range in the constructions put upon sense-impressions, from the most meagre and inadequate to the most extravagant and irrational ones. Both defective and exaggerated conceptions are among the commonest mental experiences. It follows almost as a matter of course, that in so far at least as sense-perception fails to do a truthful work for nature, the conceptions founded upon such perception must lack adequacy and propriety. The slowness of scientific progress during the past millenniums of human history may hence be accounted for; and even the keener observation, aided by the improved instruments, of the present, does not always guide science directly on the sure road to truth; as the conflicting and changing hypotheses on many points clearly prove. Indeed, so frequently are the views of scientists modified by new evidence or fresh suggestion, that one may generally, by reading a very few pages, determine with regard to a newly-printed book on science, whether the matter is really fresh, or only the paper and ink. Of her own short-comings, notwithstanding all the improvements claimed for her, science is herself so conscious as to be intensely eager for more light and more truth. That all our attempts to extract the genuine meaning from phenomena fail to realize their high aim, except very meagrely and partially, does not require any extensive showing. It is but too obvious that human thought in its sober, yet earnest, moods is greatly liable to err by defect. It sees the truth, as well as the phenomenon, through a glass darkly.

---

*Carpenter, Mental Physiology, p. 396.

†Carpenter, Men. Phys., p. 208.

But it is not merely in carrying up the facts of experience from sense to the higher court of reason, that the mind shows lack of wisdom. It frequently fails, also, to perform the easier task of understanding the ready-wrought thoughts of other minds. How has almost every original philosopher suffered through the incapacity of his disciples to grasp his full meaning. The very efforts which adherents of schools of philosophy have made to extol the head of their sect have too often furnished to the world apparent evidence of the littleness, instead of the greatness, of him whose *ipse dixit* was so faintly imitated. The practical teacher is often only too painfully aware of the defect, in the average intellect, of an ability to apprehend the full meaning of either the text-book or the words of instruction. In fact, defective understanding is so much the rule, that it is what we usually expect; and any exhibition of an approximately perfect grasp of any single subject, except by a long course of discipline, is a matter of surprise.

On the other hand, overestimates of the import, both of occurrences in nature and of thoughts, are not unusual. The moon has in times past been imagined to control the weather and the operations of nature, as well as of the human mind, to an extent unsupported by any sufficient reason. Comets have been the terror of mankind, from the belief that wars and disasters were their natural sequents. Thunder has been regarded as the direct voice of the Lord. Eclipses have to the savage mind been the signs of divine anger. So, through the whole category of marked natural phenomena, it would seem that every defect of knowledge of the true significance has been made up for by some false or distorted meaning. What of nature has been already wrought up into thought and theory has been, perhaps, not less an occasion for overwrought fancies. To believe that the earth revolves on its axis was an intolerable heresy, because it contradicted the Bible, and hence undermined the very foundation of the Church. The later theory, that the earth has for untold ages been the theatre of progress and of life, caused, too, much confusion and fluttering; but, remembering the astronomical fright, Biblical scholars thought it better this time to review the record of creation, to see whether it might not possibly admit a new construction. Now, however, we have on hand the greatest scientific heresy of all—the theory of evolution. This is for many a really dreadful beast, and no mere bush in the darkness, animated by affrighted eye-sight. It has motion of its own, as surely as a Quixotic windmill, and will certainly do harm, unless speedily dispatched. But time and greater light will probably disclose a thing as harmless as either of its predecessors.

The evidence now adduced, though but an exceedingly small fraction of what might be brought to prove the general incommensurateness of single *subjective* states with the true import of *objective* facts, whether those facts be the phenomena of nature or of spirit, seems to indicate the *impracticability of an objective standard of individual opinion.*

To illustrate from a case which is now common talk;—the Pope might be as infallible as the most thorough-bred Ultramontane could ask us to believe: you and I could not, with our fallible powers of apprehension, make in any strict sense his infallible deliverances our own. Probably there has been a much more general belief in the infallibility of the writings of Paul than in that of any Pope's ex-cathedral utterances; yet what two commentators have ever been found to agree throughout on the meaning of those writings? Did not Jesus himself have frequent occasion to charge his disciples with slowness of heart and want of understanding? Whether we have the spoken words of the living teacher, or the written ones of the dead, we are, as all experience shows, liable to more or less misconstruction and false apprehension.

Lapse of time is probably, in general, unfavorable to the exact reproduction of recorded thought. It may be doubted whether any vigorous thinker can precisely reproduce *his own* mental experiences of years ago. Dr. Carpenter (Men. Phys., p. 456) remarks: "Though we are accustomed to speak of memory as if it consisted in an *exact* reproduction of past states of consciousness, yet experience is continually showing us that this reproduction is very *inexact*, through the modification which the trace has undergone in the interval Sometimes the trace has been partially obliterated, and what remains may serve to give a very erroneous (because imperfect) view of the occurrence. And where it is one in which our own feelings are interested, we are extremely apt to lose sight of what goes against them, so that the representation given by memory is altogether one-sided." But, besides a possible partial obliteration, another fact of mental experience may modify memory, namely, the fact that the mind grows not merely by accretion (*exogenously*), but internally (*endogenously*); and again, not altogether, as our botanical terms in parentheses might seem figuratively to intimate, by a development, as it were, of new fibres of thought parallel to the old, but by a method which fancy may picture as involving an anastomosing of the new with the old; so that in recalling an old thought we cannot but rethink it under a multitude of new relations. In this *plexus* of experiences it may even not always be easy to distinguish the older from the newer; partly because more or less of unconsciousness may have attended the perhaps gradual process by which several apparently independent thoughts have come to modify each other.

What takes place thus in individual experience goes on in larger measure in collective experience. The sentiments and the entire thought-currents of communities are undergoing gradual modification. As a consequence, language changes. Words in the course of time lose their old meaning and take on new ones, till oftentimes the primitive, or so-called literal, meaning is entirely beyond our reach. Even when the etymology is certainly known, it is considered a very unreliable guide to the proper present signification. Who now thinks, for instance, of an *enthusiast* as one inspired by, or full of, God (ἔνθεος), or of a *tube* as a trumpet (tuba), or of a *ray* of light as a staff (radius)? With words, phrases and sentences change their meaning; and hence old forms of speech may once have had a determinate import, which has now become indeterminate. Of the judicial oath, Hickok (Moral Science, p. 220) says: "The oath may imply a prayer for Divine help, or an imprecation of Divine vengeance. The usual phrase, 'So help you God,' *ita te Deus adjuvet,* may imply conscious assumption of increased responsibility, and conscious frailty under temptation and perverting influences, and thus an appeal to God to add His help to sustain the enhanced responsibility; as, 'may God so strengthen me, as in my sincerity I throw myself upon His grace.' Or, it may imply, as is more commonly understood, the imprecation of Divine desertion if the man prove false; 'so God help me only as I speak the truth.'" Suppose now, for further illustration, we take the sentence, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The phrase, *In the beginning* was until comparatively recently supposed to refer to a time which could be computed, at least approximately, by means of data given in the canonical books, taken together with the known period elapsed since the beginning of the Christian era. But, science having interposed some difficulty in the way of the seemingly obvious import, other views have come into vogue; so that the meaning of "in the beginning" seems now to float between a point of time about six thousand years ago, and the farthest conceivable point in past eternity. The sense of the word *created* seems also to be subject to some range of interpretation. In view of all the difficulties and possibilities involved, can any better *rule* of interpretation be given than that most undictatorial one: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind"?

The right of private judgment in all such cases is not simply a privilege, but a necessity, if one is to judge at all. If the human mind really puts any construction on what is presented to its view, it will put its own construction. Private opinion may perhaps, in most cases, be stinted in its growth by forced suppression of utterance; for thought thrives by communication; but so long as it lives at all, it will still retain its subjective character. Auxiliary objective evidence will of course enter into the results of deliberation, and every new evidence will work more or less change; but still there will hold good of the mental vision what Carlyle says of the natural: "A man can see what he brings an eye to see."*

Again, the subjective peculiarity of apprehension is not limited to the simple rendering which each mind makes for itself of what is objectively presented. Ideas do not come into the mind solitary and single, or by one simple series. As a showy street procession is generally accompanied on either side by a moving throng of spectators, so is every regular train of thought waited upon by several collateral trains. The Shakespearean drama, with its main plot and accompanying side-plays, furnishes an illustration. Now these side-plays, which fancy by the law of association or otherwise connects with a main consideration, often furnish a large share of what really occupies the mind. Suppose one is giving what is called strict attention to an orator; what is heard may direct the drift of mental action, but memories, illustrations, criticisms, objections, inferences, questions, applications, and the like, often so crowd in as to straiten, if not to close up, the passage-way for the speaker's line of thought.

Nor is this crowding in of accessory thoughts confined to the hearer. It belongs to the experience of the speaker as well. Not seldom indeed does a lively speaker seem to leap from one train of

---

*Charles A. DeKay, in a reccent article in *Scribner*, entitled "A Bouquet of Japanese Verses," after giving the following translation from the Japanese—"In the harbor of Naniwa the flowers of the trees which ought to bloom after winter, now that the spring is come, they blossom, the flowers of the trees"—goes on to say: "Judging from those we comprehend more fully, it is impossible to say that the words are not poetical to Japanese, for we cannot tell what depth of suggestion they may contain. The poet tries to give only just enough to point the reader to the direction his thoughts should take, and leaves to him the supreme pleasure of discovery. What fearless reader of Emerson has not gained a subtle delight from wringing the essence of thought from his obscure simplicity?"

thought to another, and sometimes with wonderful effect. Even a new train of mental imagery may be started by some casual occurrence, leading a speaker into a strain of eloquence as surprising to himself as to his hearers. In reading, as well as in hearing, we are frequently to understand much more than is said at all. We are to "read between the lines," if we would get the true meaning. "The cloak which I left at Troas bring with thee," appears to be a common-place request; but when these words are thought of as those of one confined in a deep, damp dungeon, laboring "under the sufferance of racking pain, and surrounded with unutterable horrors," and "communicating with the world for the last time," the common-place vanishes, and the simple words mean volumes.

From what has been said, it is easy to infer that there are two obstacles in the way of an exact understanding of the thoughts of other men and other times; one obstacle being the fact that no man ever expresses his mind completely, and the other, that no man can enter so fully into sympathy with another as to reproduce his mental experience, even though that experience were given in a form as lively as "thoughts that breathe and words that burn."

The idea, then, of an *objective standard* of precisely what we shall think, believe, or pray for, seems utterly futile and inconsistent; the strict unification of the subjective and objective implied in such an idea being, beyond all apparent question, impossible.

A word of caution may here not be out of place. Because any attempt to comprehend the thought of the past can effectuate at best an approximation, involving some accommodation of the original import to the capacity of the recipient mind, there is on this account no justification for the act of purposely putting an unmeant construction upon a revered old formulary, for the sake of making it appear that one agrees with it. It may be very pleasant to imagine that we find consent to our pet opinions in the great worthies of the past. It may even be natural to take a little pride in being able to teach our less illuminated predecessors what their own words really meant. But would it not be more honest to confess that, on account of our changed standpoint, we find reason to differ from them?

We have now considered a few phases of the errors to which the human mind is subject, by virtue of its peculiar inner constitution;

by virtue of the fact that each mind takes in data through its own peculiar media, in consequence of which there is liability to diminution or exaggeration of the reality, as well as to a variety of false coloring. Such errors might perhaps be called collectively *errors of impression* or *errors of subjectivation.*

Corresponding to the process of subjectivation or internizing, there is a process of objectivation or externizing: and, after considering the imperfections of impression, it would seem natural to suspect a probable imperfection of expression. Indeed, expression or utterance may be regarded as in an important sense a *reflex* of impression. The intimate relation of the two has, in fact, led us to trench upon this second part of the subject in the discussion of the first. Still there is need of a further development.

The expression of emotion furnishes ready illustrations of excess and defect, similar to what have been adduced in regard to cognition. A moderate degree of pleasure, grief, or anger, will show itself in a most pronounced manner in the case of one person; while another will scarcely indicate his deepest feelings, except it be by reserve or silence. Indeed the same individual may at different times incline to excess, and to defect, of utterance. To be sure, pent up emotion will do its work in some way. Silent grief has been said to bring on the death of its subject. But such a result, though in a philosophic sense it may be an utterance of the feeling, is not so to the casual observer; and to such the same apparent cause of feeling must seem in different cases to produce very different degrees of manifestation.

In regard to thought, too, there is perhaps as little proportion between the reality and the utterance as in the case of emotion; though, from the fact that thought awakens less sympathy, the disproportion may be less striking. That it is recognized is shown by the remark often made of a person of peculiarly fluent utterance, that "he talks too much"; while a man of taciturn habits not seldom gets credit for a large fund of secreted wisdom.

Not to dwell on this particular phase of the subject, it may be interesting to note a few variations in the manner of objectivating ideas, which seem to have more or less relation to gradation in culture, or to be subject to some kind of periodicity growing out of the rhythm of history.

It may be remarked that the inward movements of the human soul are evidenced in several ways; as by language, gesticulations and attitudes, rites and ceremonies, representations by pictures and solid figures, symbols, etc.

In tracing any cultivated language from its earlier to its later stages, it is obvious that in its earlier condition it is more the reflex expression of sensation and perception; and that it gradually acquires a power to express abstractions, and to mark the subtilties of speculative thought. Language, in other words, varies with the development of the national mind of which it is the utterance. The poets, with their panoramas of sensuous imagery, come before the philosophers and the scientists, with their arrays of unseen forces ,and their armories of technical terms. Indeed, some go so far as to assume that all language has an interjectional foundation; the primitive ejaculatory expressions of emotion being, by time and experience, worked-up into sense-words. Others, however, who would not go to that extreme, still assert that "savages possess in a high degree the faculty of uttering their minds directly in emotional tones and interjections; of going straight to nature to furnish themselves with imitative sounds, including reproductions of their own direct emotional utterances, as means of expression of ideas, and of introducing into their formal language words so produced."* Another way of characterizing to the same effect the earlier growth of language would be to say, that it deals largely in metaphors, presenting itself, like the old picture-writing, in concrete, living forms addressed to the perceptive, rather than to the conceptive, faculty. Indeed the savage, with his few articulate words, and his many significant inflections, intonations, and gestures, makes himself into a sort of figure of speech, in broad contrast with, for instance, the modern English parliamentary orator, who is said to speak with the air of one "conversing on public affairs." It cannot be said that the latter is less in earnest than the former, any more than that the person of mature mind, who reads the most thrilling narrative with closed lips and changeless countenance, is less in earnest than the child that accompanies the nervous movement of its eye along the line of words with an audible whisper.

---

*Tylor, Primitive Culture, Vol. I., p. 163.

To the same effect may be adduced the difference of manner in the same speaker before different audiences. The "fine phrensy" of the lawyer, which may "avail much" with a jury of unlettered men, must be exchanged for a discriminating dialectic in order to influence a court composed of men learned in the law. Lively expression is more effective with the less cultured mind, because such a mind unites the expression and the meaning, the form and the substance, more closely. It may perhaps have occurred to the reader, in watching the development of early childhood, to be surprised at the child's eager recognition of the human figure, or the figure of familiar animals, in a picture. To the little girl her dolls, with their miniature furniture and utensils, seem to be not, as they are to older persons, mere images of realities, but in a sense the realities themselves. It is wonderful, too, how faint a resemblance to a human likeness will serve the purpose of embodying the child's conception of humanity. Almost anything to call a doll will do.

A similar facility in transferring the fancies of the brain to an objective receptacle belongs to the child-nature of the savage. Tylor (Primitive Culture,Vol. II., p. 151,) remarks: "The conception of such human relics [of dead friends] becoming fetishes, inhabited or at least acted through by the souls which formerly belonged to them, would give a rational explanation of much relic-worship, otherwise obscure. A further stretch of imagination enables the lower races to associate the souls of the dead with mere objects, a practice which may have had its origin in the merest childish make-believe, but which would lead a thorough savage animist straight on to the conception of the soul entering the object as a body. Mr. Darwin saw two Malay women in Keeling Island, who held a wooden spoon dressed in clothes, like a doll; this spoon had been carried to the grave of a dead man, and becoming inspired at full moon, in fact lunatic, it danced about convulsively like a table or a hat at a modern spirit seance."

As regards the method by which an idea is made to take up an abode in any particular receptacle, there is perhaps more generally no special effort or conscious intention in the matter. People who believe a house to be haunted are not aware of any mental act on their part by which it has become so. That is all the work of the ghostly inhabitants themselves. Almost as little is fancy aware of any agency in arraying Virtue in robes of spotless white, in directing thought upward to the residence of the Good, or in painting Hope in rainbow-hues. Ideas themselves are generally credited with a power to display their own characters under appropriate aspects and conditions.

There are not wanting, however, cases of conscious effort to incorporate ideas. The popular writer or speaker has frequent occasion to seek an illustration or a metaphor into which to put his thought, in order to give it tangibility. He may, in such case, be quite aware of the labor of so shaping the receptacle that it will just take in the proposed notion. If he be inventive, he will probably make new connections of forms and ideas—of the bodies and souls of thought; and to that extent he will be making new language. In this procedure, though possibly sometimes the illustration may be father to the thought, yet for the most part there is an evident pre-existence of the idea. The illustration or metaphor is to take up and convey what is already a reality to the conceiving mind. The savage's embodiment of spiritual powers in a fetish occasionally bears analogy to this conscious thought-embodying process. It is said of the Dacotas, that they "would pick up a round boulder, paint it, and then addressing it as grandfather. make offerings to it, and pray to it to deliver them from danger."* There seems evident here the notion of introducing into the stone the functional character that is to make it an object of adoration. The authority just quoted from says also that the Hindu's hollow clay idol receives no veneration for itself, but becomes an object of worship only "when the officiating Brahman has invited the deity to dwell in the image, performing the ceremony of the 'adhivâsa', or inhabitation,† after which he puts in the eyes and the 'prâna,' *i. e.* breath, life, or soul."

Thus the Hindu shows a dawning power to distinguish between the deity and his local residence; and it may be added that even the savage African believes the god is not bound to the image, or that he "is present sometimes with more and sometimes with less intensity." In partial justification of the Hindu's intelligence in comparison with our own, we might say that his ceremony of inviting-in the spirit is analogized in the ordinary process of putting a meaning into a new word one may chance to meet with. The definition is looked up and thought into the word henceforth to be its embodiment. Again, the statement that in Peru, "when the worship of a certain sacred stone was given up, a parrot flew from it into another stone, to which adoration was paid," as well as similar statements with regard to conveyances of spiritual influence by birds or otherwise to and from idols in Polynesia;* are also partly paralleled in the transfer of an idea from one word to another in the course of linguistic revolution, or even in an ordinary case of translation. The old theory of heat and electricity, as invisible fluids passing into and out of solid bodies, has been adduced as another illustration of the same point.

---

*Tylor, Prim. Cul., Vol. II., p. 161.

†It might, perhaps, be a question worthy of consideration, whether the consecration of churches be hot historically somehow related to this ceremony.

But although there may be found in the lower stages of culture such symptoms of an incipient ability to distinguish between idea and symbol, it still cannot fail to appear that the untutored mind in general puts the invisible power and the sensible manifestation in much closer relation than does the cultured intellect. Deity, in order to be approachable, must also be sensible. The sensible form becomes the reality, beyond which it is not necessary to look for a hidden power or force. At all events, the average image-worshiper, no doubt, practically makes no conscious distinction between spirit and image, but invests the latter with all the powers and functions of the former.

Absurd as such a view may be to us, we may yet readily see that it does not imply an absolute estrangement from the highest type of intelligence. Survivals of a modified fetishism may be recognized in official garments and badges, in habiliments of mourning, in emblems, &c. A trace of the same principle may be seen in the general tendency to *formulate,* and then to regard the formula as being a kind of embodiment of the forces or principles involved. How many a youth will give, on being inquired of for the reason of a numerical process, the *rule,* without a thought that the rule requires a reason, just as much as his operation. The *law* of gravity, the mere formulation of the force's mode of action, is often confounded with gravity itself. Wording is so nearly confounded with thinking, that some intelligent persons suppose it impracticable to think without words, or to know without being able to state the knowledge in language.

---

*Miss H. G. Brittan (in Christian Witness) gives the method of transfer of Juggernaut from one image to another, by taking out of the body of the old idol a small box which is supposed to hold the spirit of the god, and placing it inside the new image. Modern spiritualists carry the matter of spirit transfer still further, in believing that "spirits of the living as well as of the dead" can be "summoned by mediums to distant spirit circles."

If, indeed, it shall turn out, according to the hypothesis of some, that the agency of the *sensorium* is strictly a condition of all-consciousness, it may be that an entire riddance of the fetish principle is not so easy to be accomplished. The resort of science to such expressions as "imponderable bodies," "electric fluid," and "ultimate atoms," shows how difficult it is to get clear of a sensuous element in any conception of the forces of nature. Some of the old terms of this class are now discarded; but the question might be asked whether the substituted expressions, though freed from some of the grossness of the old, do not bear fetish traces, to be further reduced by advancing approximations to the truth. Descartes is said to have assumed that the agency of the nerve in transmitting an impression upon a sensory organ to the brain was due to the flow of "animal spirits" along the nerve. Huxley would have us say, that the same transmission is due to the propagation of a "molecular change" along the nerve.* But should a modification of the molecular theory take place, as already a modification of the cell theory has done, the statement of nervous transmission might perhaps require a further adjustment. The expression *molecular change* is on its face very inadequate to a *distinct* conception; too, little removed, indeed, from the indifferent character of the hollow clay image which, for aught we can see, might have one kind of spirit *invited into* it as well as another. The remark of Berkeley, that "the greatest men, when they give way to abstraction, have recourse to words having no certain signification, and, indeed, mere scholastic shadows," is all too applicable to even the best attempts at giving form to thought.

---

*Address before the British Association at Belfast, August 25, 1874.

Let it not be supposed that it was meant to be said the phrase "propagation of molecular change," is no improvement on the Cartesian one "flow of animal spirits," for the intimation of what really takes place in nervous conveyance. The latter gives the notion of a material *stream;* while the former suggests some sort of a change of mood, progressing from particle to particle along the fiber, without any *large* motion of single particles. Now it is, doubtless, as great a mistake to suppose a material flow along the nerve as to think water flows in horizontal undulation.* A false notion is eliminated, then, by a change of terms. The present rapid progress of science is constantly requiring new adjustments of language to a better knowledge of the facts; the result being, that the intimate relation once existing between word and idea, is becoming much broken in upon. A family, by a frequent change of residence, loses identity with a certain dwelling or locality; while with the permanent landed estates of Europe, the "house" is a sort of fetish for the family. The transmigration of ideas from one symbol to another, surpasses in frequency even the locomotive American's change of homes. The stenographer gives his version of a speech, intelligible only to the initiated; this is transcribed into "copy" for the compositor, who puts it in "type"; and at length it comes in "print" to the eye of the reader, who makes out of the most arbitrary succession of signs, the probable meaning of the one who first gave signals of his cogitations by audible articulations.

Persons partially ignorant of the transmigrations and successive disembodiments which thought undergoes in the modern modes of transmission, like the man who was sure his message had not been telegraphed, because he could see it "hanging on the hook," or like the other who thought the reason why he did not hear a message was that he was "a little deaf in one ear," may not be aware of the degree of conventionality involved in these methods of communication. Indeed, so slow, oftentimes, is the mind in drawing *obvious* inferences, that the pianist may scarcely have seriously thought how unsympathizing a mechanism his fine feeling has to pass through in order to get musical utterance.

---

*It ought, perhaps, to be noted here, that scientists, by the use of the terms "nerve-waves," "molecular motions," &c., make their meaning on the whole as clear, perhaps, as the present state of knowledge will allow; although the single expression "molecular change," seems rather vague.

Yet the fact that an ordinary reader takes in with his eye what he sends out with his voice, so that it reaches the mind of the next recipient through the ear, ought to have taught us that thought is not strictly tied to form; or, at all events, that its true *spiritual body* is something transcending sight and sound. But if any more decided hints in this direction are wanted, the multitudinous modes of telegraphic transmission—by dots and dashes, by dots arranged to represent dots and dashes, by printing and autograph-writing, by sound, by the "flickering of a reflected ray of light," by a waving ink-line, etc.—would seem to leave little to be desired in proof of the essential indifference of ideas to modes of communication. However naturally spoken language may have originally sprung up and grown into beautiful proportions, it is no longer the divine incarnation of thought that it once was.* A man's words, written or spoken, are indications of his thinking; and the sensations they awaken suggest *what* he is thinking, somewhat as the smell of smoke suggests what is burning.

Now, it will hardly need to be demonstrated that a tendency to disembodiment or "disestablishment" of ideas is in harmony with abstractive generalization.

The *abstract noun* of our grammars suggests a quality, as it were, issuing forth from its substance, to be caught and held fast in thought only. This analysis carried to its utmost would give

---

*If the harmonic relations of music are the direct results of numerical ratios in the undulations of sound, so that it might be said that the combined tones actually involve the ratios, then there might seem to be some sense in assuming that a set of thinkable relations are *embodied* in sounds. Then an *inference* might be drawn, that sentiments, as well as numerical ratios, may thus be embodied; and it might further be urged in favor of this view, that the ordinary *vowel sounds* have been demonstrated to be compound tones, made up on strictly harmonic principles. It is perhaps impossible to say how far this mode of reasoning might apply to a theory of ideal language. But it may be doubted whether our slightly developed musical perception, having thus far reached a practical range scarcely exceeding the number 7, the ordinary harmonic series, 1, ½, ⅓, ¼, 1-5, ⅙, being even more limited, would be able to judge very far with regard to the fitness of sound to idea. It may even be questioned whether our ordinary notions of the fitness of certain music to express certain sentiments are not derived largely from experience or conventionality. Complex experiment, and not the ear alone, discovers the fact that the octave involves the ratio of 1 to 2, the simplest of all the ratios.

all the elements in separation. Then a mental reconstruction might furnish a whole not identical with the original reality, but possessing the transparency and logical consistency of pure thought. The process, however, is never carried out in this ideal way, at least in the human mind. The course of abstraction is gradual and always partial; so that, to get a reconstructed whole, it is necessary to patch on the ideal part to the residual real; the result of which is illustrated by the ordinary combination of a substantive and adjective, as it were a half-separated and half-united fetish and spirit. Still the tendency of *progressive* mind is towards the completed ideal; and the progressive idealizing of every objectivating art is, of course, involved in the same tendency. This in principle, and to some extent in examples, we have seen from the previous discussion; but it may be interesting to trace out in a case or two how, in progressive sequence, the adaptation of language and signs to a more ideal purpose is actually made. An example in point may be had in the history of the art of numbering.

It is well known that savages (as well as children) make much use of the "digits" (fingers and toes) in counting. It is related that a person wishing to know the number of slain, on a certain occasion, in a savage country, inquired of an individual, who, after severe effort to count them up by assigning a finger to each person, at length held up his hand three times to indicate the number fifteen.* An instance of a general method of numeration is given, where numeral words exist up to four. Then five is "a whole hand," six "one of the other hand," ten "both hands." Eleven is represented by stretching out both hands and one foot, with the words, "one of the foot," fifteen by "a whole foot," and twenty by "one Indian," forty by "two Indians," &c. A brief anecdote, once related to the writer, may be admissible, to show how the notion of *concreteness* in number clings to the partially cultivated mind. A person challenged another on a wager to "count a hundred." A third person, on hearing of this challenge and perceiving the catch, said he thought that, if he was furnished with a hundred kernels of corn, he could count them.

An advance on this concrete representation of numbers by things, would be a full set of numeral words; which, however according to the general law of progress, will be likely to retain traces of the older method. It will be sufficient to remark, that in addition to certain etymological indications of "digit numerals," there has been bequeathed from this source to our own civilization the decimal system, with survivals of a quinary system (*e. g.* in the use of the Roman v., vi, &c., and xv. xvi., &c.,) as well as of a vigesimal system (in the counting by scores). A third stage in representing numbers, is found in the use of such letter-signs as have just been adverted to in the Roman notation; and perhaps a further advanced stage in the Indian (so-called Arabic) figures—certainly more advanced in usefulness on account of the *local values* introduced; and at length algebraic computation abstracts from *particular* numbers, using only symbols of numbers and their relations in general. It may be added that the higher analysis carries the abstracting and symbolizing methods still further, and that the end of the process is "not yet." So long as new mines of meaning in quantitative relations shall continue to be opened, new modes of symbolizing will also be required.

---

* Tylor, Prim. Cul., Vol. II., p. 244.

The history of the ordinary alphabet may furnish another example. The sounds used in speech, were at one time *embodied* in the pictures (entire or partial) of objects, each having the phonetic force of the initial sound of its name, as Aleph, Beth, Gimel, ox, house, camel. These picture-forms, by a gradual reduction, became the simply suggestive characters now so familiar to us. Some attempts have been made, as is known, to get an alphabet more completely phonetic. It is by no means impossible that efforts in this direction, when more scientifically undertaken, may eventually succeed. Indeed, they have already succeeded largely, as regards short-hand writing.

A case of still greater reduction from an archetypal form occurs in signs of reverence, if Herbert Spencer is right in his conjectures. According to his view, the act of prostration in presence of a sovereign or a feudal lord has been in various ways abridged; for instance, in the reverence of the Russian serf, who bends his head to the ground; and in the salaam of the Hindu, which is farther abbreviated successively into a bow and a nod. Again, the curtsy is conceived to be an abridged act of kneeling; and as the Mohammedan worshiper not only kneels but bows his head to the ground, the curtsy may well be styled "an evanescent form of the aboriginal prostration." Even the act of "bowing and scraping" is explained as a preliminary to going on one knee.* The result in these cases is that mere intimation of proper respect takes the place of a humiliating act.

Thanks to growing intelligence! We are no longer obliged to count altogether on our fingers, to read only from characters rudely and laboriously made by hand, or to lie down in the dust in literal self-abasement before a superior. Nor will improving civilization be likely in such respects to go back on itself. To stick tenaciously to old symbols, whether in the form of words, institutions, customs, or anything exponential of a deliverance of human nature, must then be like clinging to one's own baby-talk. Neither are the *fathers* so much honored by our exact imitation of their manners as seems by some to be imagined. The young man who could not give up carrying a stone in one end of the bag to balance the grain in the other, because his father, grandfather, and great-grandfather had used that same stone for that same purpose, so far from honoring that line of ancestry, proved rather its incapacity for upward development. About the only use the present age can make of such a man is to prove by him that man has never made advancement, much less could ever have come up from an ape. Such a proof may be, to some at least, worth all it costs; but the party of progress will assume that, though there may be apparent "dead points" in a generally onward movement, though there may be real retrogressions—eddies in the current of history—and possibly may be such a thing as "going back to get a better start," still preference is to be given to signs of change from the grosser to the more ideal, from superstition to reason. Think of the gladiatorial show, and of the tournament, exhibitions into which the very elite of their respective times could throw their whole souls; and then say whether the return of such exponents of popular sentiment would be evidence of real improvement. Indeed one might better employ his influence against the swimming matches and regattas of the present, than in favor of bringing back their more barbarous predecessors; against the modern horse-race and theatre, rather than in favor of restoring the Olympic games and the ancient theatre, with their excessive immoralities.

---

*Herbert Spencer, Universal Progress, pp. 79, 80.

But whether we will or not, growing civilization at large inclines to slough off, either gradually or suddenly, the wrappings of the idea which, either on account of their cramping influence or their natural wear and decay, seem no longer fitting. It seems very likely that some of the oldest integuments of human ideas have vanished, leaving no certain trace behind; as it is supposed to have happened to the earliest life-forms in geology. Besides these supposable lost forms, there are well-marked fossils. Every language, even during its vigorous life, comes to have its obsolete words; every nation its obsolete customs and laws; every generation its remembered usages that are no more. Then there are the old forms that survive, but have lost their meaning, except for children or the ignorant, or, from being serious, have become sports or amusements. Astrology, foamerly "an honored branch of philosophy," is now, so far as it still exists, relegated to the ignorant and over-credulous. The bow and arrow, and the sling, once full of deadly significance, are in present civilization children's toys. "Arts of divination and games of chance are so similar in principle that the very same instrument passes from one use to the other." We may add the American boys' celebration of Hallow-eve as " corn night," as an illustration in point.

But to pass on;—many old institutions, customs, and forms of expression still occupy their old places of apparent dignity, but with a large depreciation of real meaning. " When we remember," says Herbert Spencer, "how the divinity at first ascribed to kings was not a complimentary fiction but a supposed fact; and how, further, under the fetish philosophy, the celestial bodies are believed to be personages who once lived among men, we see that the appellations of Oriental rulers, " Brother to the Sun," &c., were probably once expressive of a genuine belief; and have simply, like many other things, continued in use after all meaning has gone out of them."* Might it not be added, that in such a country as England the king or queen, under the present style of administering the government, is little more than a legal fiction? a fiction which the strongest offshoot of the English nation has dispensed with, apparently without loss of either strength or unity.

---

*Universal Progress, p. 72.

Every one knows the profound significance and authority once attaching to a seal. It absorbed the whole force of a signature, which in its original import is a sealing or affixing a *signum.* The name of the instrument is still, to be sure, a high-sounding one; and it is said that the great seal of England makes its ponderous impress upon a large amount of wax in the course of a year; but the citizen of America, though occasionally getting sight of the coat of arms of some state or corporation, used mostly for the sake of keeping up appearances, cannot help thinking how little real meaning there is in a wafer covered by a blank bit of paper, or even a twirl of the pen inclosing the word "seal." The reason for a growing negligence of form is that the evidence of authorship, once inhering in the seal, has passed into the handwriting of the (now *genuine*) signature (in the modern sense); a handwriting being provable, by comparison, beyond doubt, by simple reference to an expert. Again, the marriage ceremony, which had in European civilization become such a fetish-embodiment of marriage itself, has in several at least of the American States, so far yielded its claim as sole evidence of what "God hath joined together," that other evidence is admissible; and it is said that in California, under a recently enacted statute, it is only necessary for the parties to have their assumption of the marital relation put upon record, to answer all the requirements of the law. The oath, in olden time believed to be the very palladium of truthfulness, is now put on a par with a formula of affirmation; nor would, possibly, much be lost, if this mock-oath were dispensed with.

An interesting case of prolonged life of an old rite, symbol, or word, is when there is a change, or an apparent change of import. As regards words, the changes in their signification were alluded to in a previous connection. The old sense-content is often supplanted, or partially supplanted, by a thought-content; the word becoming intellectualized, and thus possessed of more life and soul, the result being somewhat the reverse of that in which an organic form becomes petrified. Such changes are all the while going on in every language; but the modern use of the Greek as material for the technical terms of science is quite noticeable, and may remind one of the use which the Christians one while made of the Coliseum.

The origin of Christmas, as given by Tylor, is that the Roman winter-solstice festival, in the later days of Roman paganism, celebrated on December 25th in connection with the worship of the sun-god Mythra, and deriving thence the name "Dies Natalis Solis invicti," birth-day of the unconquered Sun, being adopted in the Western Church, was also bequeathed to the Eastern as the "Christian Dies Natalis." It seems that an image of the goddess Rhea is now serving as a statue of the Virgin; and that noted kiss-worn toe of Peter is said to have been kissed by pagan lips as a toe of Jupiter."* So, many an old festival, custom or rite, appears to have renewed its youth by a change of name, and as our trust in human progress would prompt us to believe, at least a partial change of significance;† yet it must be acknowledged that the very best signs of advancement are probably not to be looked for in just this line of evidence, and that too often the persistence of an old formality under a new name means not progress, but decadence. Still there is some meaning in the fact that the old must change its *apparent* import, in order to retain its place. It is thus shown that every "earthen vessel" must at least seem to be refilled at intervals from a fresh fountain, or else become loathsome and neglected.

From the general tenor of the facts now adduced, it may be inferred that man's invention has always been at work to find appropriate modes of utterance of the life within; the result being an ever-advancing approximation to the wants of ever-advancing experience. If this be correct, there can properly be no fixed standard form of enunciation of thought or sentiment; and antique formularies, as vehicles of present ideas, are especially liable to objection, on the score that, taken strictly in their original sense, they may involve obsolete notions.

It likewise appears from what the discussion has disclosed, that there cannot be any reasonable insurance of a real communication of an idea or influence through symbolic act, rite, or word-formula, irrespective of the modal relations of the parties concerned.

---

* Charles Reade. The Cloister and the Hearth, p. 327.

† Charles Reade (Ibid.) puts in the mouth of the "Fra Colonna" the assertion, that "Our infant baptism is Persian, with the font, and the signing of the child's brow;" as well as that "Our holy water is pagan, and all its uses."

It was designed to consider the liability to error under one or more heads, in addition to those now adverted to; but the extent which this paper has already attained, leaves room for no more than a brief glance at them. One of these considerations pertains to what may, for want of a better name, be called *mental preoccupation.*

From earliest childhood persons are imbibing from parents, teachers, and other sources, sentiments and dogmas, the grounds of which they never search into. The sub-conscious process by which they grow-to these ways of thinking, is, perhaps, for the most part, a healthy one. At all events it seems to be the only one, under the present dispensation, by which any considerable degree of culture can be realized in the brief life of an individual. Childhood, at least, would make slow progress in education if it could believe no farther than it could demonstrate; and even youth and manhood would labor under serious disadvantages, on the same condition. Still the virtue of docility can, no doubt, like every other, be turned to a wrong account, in certain respects. If what *first comes*, under the guise of truth, is *first received*, there is danger that the real truth may afterwards be shut out at the instigation of the pre-ensconced pretender. The man who is thoroughly persuaded that the image which he worships really "fell down from Jupiter," will be slow to admit the right of competition with so venerable an object. May it be ventured here to suggest, that even where the old belief cannot be shown to be superstitious, there may still be reason for giving attention to a competing theory? The truth will not be overthrown by the mere thought of an error; nor, on the other hand, is a "holy horror" for a new hypothesis, the greatest proof of its inanity. The old notion that if a ghost is spoken to it will vanish, has some applicability to all phantoms. A hospitable and urbane treatment of them might often be the readiest mode of dissipating them; while standing in a defensive attitude on the narrow assumption of preconceived opinion, may, in the end, prove to be standing on a failing position.

Where, then, is the wisdom of shutting out the freest discussion of the scientific topics of the day? And since no Divine oracle has in unmistakable language informed us, for instance, how matter has come to exist, why should one be bound to the mere human dogma of creation from nothing? and what harm in considering the question, whether there be not present in the purest known space living forces which might, by some relative change, assume tangibility, as the cloud is born of mixing masses of apparently pure air? Indeed, the persons who now give a cautious, yet friendly reception to some of the reputed heresies of science, which most likely are at best truths in disguise, may in the end be set down with those who have "entertained angels unawares."

As a final point, we may notice what may be designated as a liability to error from comparison. We have already had occasion to observe that thought progresses, not exclusively in a uniseriate manner, but by a certain synchronal multiformity. Even the same series may be in two or more coexistent stages; as when a speaker thinks ahead of his speaking, and yet notes carefully his own utterance; or when one reads, keeping his eye a few words, or at least a few syllables, in advance of what he is vocalizing. In writing, the double process may involve a wider separation; and it has been observed that men in their writing sometimes mix in words, or parts of them, belonging some distance ahead. Another phase of simultaneous progress is seen in the ordinary school-curriculum, which carries on several studies at once; and here, too, there is opportunity for the student to show inequality of advancement on the different lines. Any one, however, can see the manifest impropriety of taking the comparative progress of any single student in different studies as furnishing a criterion of either the comparative value or the proportional difficulty of the studies in question; and yet this improper mode of judging is indulged in more or less every day by the student himself.

Still truer is it that mankind at large move on many lines of progress, and move unequally. We often hear of an individual's having lived before his time; and the same thing may occur with a nation or part of a nation. A more complicated state of the case may be that one community gets in advance in one particular, and another in a different respect. To add to even this confusion, general belief has it that not all movement is to be classed as either progressive or regressive, but that there is such a thing as a genuine *di*gression: and to this last category, as being easy of conception, many find it convenient to relegate a large share of human activity. The resultant weaving together of the once reasonable, the now reasonable, the to become reasonable, and the always absurd, forms a network not so easily unraveled. Still, the general fact being that every one is inclined to pass judgment upon his fellows, and that almost every one prefers his own position as the standpoint to judge from, many false apprehensions are likely to arise in men's mutual views of each other. One will look upon another as wild, fanatical, neglectful of historical precedents; while the latter will judge the former to be extra-conservative, living in a bygone age.

Neither of these judgments, of course, is necessarily just. It is intrinsically possible that one may live and think after an antique model as earnestly as did the heroic men of old. To put the case strongly, the aboriginal American could, at the time of the discovery of this continent, wield his stone hatchet just as effectively as could the stone-man of Europe in his day.

On the other hand, spiritual or scientific enterprise, venturing out beyond all the land-marks of history, and braving all the conservatism of the time, need be thought no more visionary or reprehensible than the bold schemes which in the historic centuries made men of record. Must it not be admitted as at least possible, that the radical religionist or scientist of the present *may* have a work before him as legitimate as had Abraham or Moses, Columbus or Copernicus?

On the whole, then, by showing a larger willingness to discover all the truth they can in each other, and by putting the most charitable construction upon what they mutually esteem to be each other's errors, men would manifest a fuller appreciation of the great fact that in the fallible human mind truth and error are not to be looked for in a state of absolute separation; and in this manifestation would show themselves wiser. Signs of improvement in this regard are, indeed, already appearing in almost every direction; giving promise of a more consistent and effectual working of reason for the true accomplishment of its mission.

ART. VII.—THE OLD LECTIONARIA OF THE CHURCH, AND THE BREVIARY.

IN our preceding article we had occasion to remark that the early church saw in the Scriptural account of creation a vast symbol of spiritual generation in the sacrament of baptism; and that Tertullian was so firmly convinced that the mystery of the incoming of the supernatural world must illustrate, and, indeed, underlie that of the natural, as to use the type with bold, polemic daring in his defense of baptism. We may now remark that this is but one example of the extent to which the so-called allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures was carried by the early church. It was almost the universal practice. Only by means of such interpretation do the selections, in most cases, show their fitness for the season with which they are connected.

Many, no doubt, will make this a serious objection, not to the principle guiding the selection, but to the passages selected, because forced into their place by what they regard a wrong interpretation. What, they ask, has the opening record of Genesis to do with baptism, or regeneration, or recreation in Christ Jesus? Such passages would be more fitting for a preface for some scientific lecture on cosmogony. What has the deluge to do with baptism or the resurrection? What has the escape from Egypt to do with spiritual mysteries of delivering grace? We are quite willing, say they, to acknowledge that we have interesting and important historical facts here, which we can study and profit by, without indulging in excursions of fancy to realms of mysteries unseen and unknown.

We shall not, at this point, attempt to defend the method of interpretation so universally employed by the greatest teachers of the Church. We will but briefly refer to that which seems to have forced the mind of the church in such direction and which we think deserves most earnest consideration.

The Scriptures were regarded as the *word of God*, having their source in the spiritual world, and reaching down into the natural world for purposes of revelation, and therefore designedly making the natural an enshrinement of the spiritual, which, from the original relation of the two, was felt to be possible. The natural in the Scriptures, whether of a physical or historical character, by the very use thus made of it by the spiritual, was felt to be lifted out of its own order into type and symbol, and sacramental correspondence, much after the same manner as water in baptism, or bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. Indeed the whole of Scripture was viewed as a vast sacrament of the unseen spiritual realities of that sphere from which it properly proceeded. In such form it was an outflow of the divine. The inner and real sense of the word, therefore, as divine, required for its recognition, it was felt, something quite distinct from mere grammatical and historical investigation. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned, and the spiritual discernment here was regarded as just this power of seeing, in and through the natural, the spiritual which, after all, was the real and only thing to be revealed, and which, for this end and no other, subordinated the natural to its own higher use, by bringing it back to the spiritual to which, in the divine mind, it was originally related, or rather perhaps co-related. In other words, the spiritual has its counterpart in the natural throughout, and the Word joins the two in the work of revealing the divine, and this conjunction is that which the allegorical method of interpretation sought to grasp.

We cannot at once therefore cast this aside, calling it fanciful and absurd; nor can we think that the merely literal, by careful disjunction from the spiritual, can give us any revelation of the heavenly. The effort must be to seize the conjunction of the two. Here there is room for serious mistakes, blunders of apprehension; but it is quite remarkable that the allegorical school of interpretation always showed itself more free from heretical bias than any other, and drew to itself the very highest theological genius of the church.

We are now prepared to continue our examination of the selections indicated in our previous article, beginning with the fifth (Isaiah lv. 1–11). Here Christ is presented as the fountain of living waters and the source of all spiritual nourishment; and all are freely challenged to come unto Him. The whole passage may be regarded as the call of Christ to faith and spiritual activity. The word of God, as spirit and life, descends from heaven as rain and snow, watering and refreshing the life of humanity, accomplishing the regeneration and glorification of those who hear and receive it. No passage could have been selected more befitting the service for which it was chosen. It may be well to remark here, in reference to the opening verses of the chapter, that in the Western Church there was a custom of giving wine and milk to those just baptized, and in the Eastern Church, milk and honey. S. Jerome, among others, mentions this in his commentary on Isaiah, (" *Mos ac typus in Occidentis Ecclesiis hodie usque servatur, ut renatis in Christo vinum lacque tribuatur.*")

The sixth selection has very much the character of the fifth and needs, therefore, no comment.

The seventh selection (Ezekiel xxxvii. 1–14), contains the remarkable vision of the prophet, when, carried away in the Spirit of the Lord and set down in the valley full of dry bones, he was commanded to prophesy upon the bones; and when by the breath, coming from the four winds, the bones revived and the slain were made to live. The vision is interpreted for the prophet, and the interpretation takes in a wide scope of prophecy in the words "Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves. And I shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land; then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord."

It is vain to confine a vision of such character as this merely to a captive condition of God's people in a temporal or historical view, out of which they are providentially delivered. Every historical captivity of God's people holds within itself a reference to a more profound and spiritual captivity, and to a deliverance also that reaches infinitely beyond what may be regarded as the natural deliverance. The inner spiritual sense and meaning of the vision is no doubt to be found in Christ, who breathes forth his Spirit, regenerating, sanctifying and glorifying his people, releasing them from the captivity of hell, and translating them into the kingdom of everlasting life and light. What better theme for solemn meditation and profitable reflection could engage the Christian heart during the vigil of Easter or Pentecost? It harmonizes perfectly with the whole services challenging the attention of God's people.

The eighth section (Isaiah, iv.), is peculiar and somewhat difficult to characterize. The chapter begins, "And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach." Only as we bring into view the old interpretation of this passage, the spiritual inner meaning which was supposed to be lodged or conjoined with the literal sense, does it seem to have any fitness whatever for the season to which it is assigned. The hidden sense of this passage, according to S. Jerome, is this: The sevenfold graces of the Holy Spirit seize upon Jesus, because no one else could be found in whom they could take up their eternal habitation, or out from whom they could properly flow forth into the world. Having mentioned the literal sense, S. Jerome writes: "Hoc secundum literam. Cæterum in adventu Domini Salvatoris, septem mulieres, id est, septem gratiæ Spiritus sancti, apprehendent Jesum, quem multo tempore desideraverant, quia nullum alium potuerant invenire, in quo æterna statione requiescerent." This interpretation was sufficently general to be introduced into one of the hymns of Adam de St. Victor:

"Umbra septem mulierum,
Figuraris ipsum verum,
Idem ipse forma rerum,
Septiformis Spiritus."
Gautier, Vol. 1, 137.

So subsequently in the chapter, Christ washes away the filth of the daughters of Zion, *i. e.* he cleanses by the washing of regeneration, baptizing with the Holy Ghost and fire. The early church seemed on every hand to suppose that the spiritual, which the word of God uttered in and through the prophets, could not be other than the spiritual as having its source and substance in Christ. The Old Fathers hesitated not to bring the two together, as necessarily belonging to each other. To them the revelation in nature and in Scripture was throughout Messianic, and could not be otherwise, for only from Christ could there be any outflow of the spiritual for the world or for the Scriptures. Without such a conception as this their method of interpretation must be viewed as mere fancy work, perfectly arbitrary, and unsettled, and worthless. The tendency of the present day seems to be to begin with the merely material or physical and ascend to the spiritual, which may be the proper method of scientific reason; but the reason of faith among the old divines pursued the reverse process, and saw the spiritual reaching down and outward to its ultimates in nature, and recognized therefore in the revealing word of God such a use of nature as would call into view the substantial spiritual for spiritual discernment. It must be acknowledged that while science may strive to go from flesh up to the word, it should not deny the possibility of the faith process, which sees the Word *made flesh* and dwelling among us. So much we have felt to be necessary, in reference to the almost universal method of the Fathers in handling the Scriptures.

Time fails us to examine the selection farther, nor is it necessary. Enough has been said to make apparent the principle which guided the selections of the old Lectionaria, and this is the main object we have had in view.

We wish, however, to add something more in reference to the educational power involved in such a system of scriptural selections for study in our Sunday-schools.

How much must an earnest pastor feel crippled and hindered, if, while he is feeding the flock entrusted to his care, a large portion of his congregation, Sunday after Sunday, is virtually disconnected from the main service of the sanctuary, in lessons of scripture, in hymns, in prayers, and indeed in the whole atmosphere of worship! He may see them moving in quite an opposite system of discipline, without any outward collision it may be, but with what is far worse, an inward diremption of thought, a tearing apart of the spiritual meditations of the Lord's day, a dispersion of tongues throughout the whole work of the soul's edification.

Take for example the season of Easter. Here the natural season even forms one of the chords of the festal joy.

"Mundi renovatio
Nova parit gaudia,
Resurgente Domino
Conresurgent omnia."

The whole service of the Church is of course moulded by the great festival theme. The hymns, the prayers, and the selections of scripture are of necessity made to revolve around the central pascal glory. The season even reaches out into the sportive habits of the household, and the children, with their colored eggs, seem to have caught some straying beam from the effulgent mystery. Now in the midst of all this, the Sunday-school convenes, and moves forward in a line of instruction and devotion, entirely separate and disconnected. It is studying the geography of Palestine, sounding the depths of the Dead Sea, tracing out the successive journeys of St. Paul, singing some hymn, the sentiment and music of which would do for a pic-nic party perhaps, and all this in the interest of edification. Of course this is an extreme case; yet no doubt of most frequent occurrence.

It may be said, however, that if we do away with Easter, the whole difficulty will be removed. If we have no Christmas, no Good Friday, no Easter, no Pentecost, no Church Year with its papistical order, as it is sometimes called, then all this trouble is done with, and we can go revolving around the sun, having January and February and March lessons, and so on, without any chance of conflict, if the pastor will but reasonably accommodate himself to this partial sun-worship. The mysteries of Christ's nativity, suffering, death, resurrection and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost we have, it is true, but not fixed for this time or that time, or indeed to any time at all. But is the order immaterial here? Can you begin in the middle of Geometry and move each way with equal benefit to the student, whose reason is to apprehend the study? Is there no method in the Revelation itself, as in the Creed, and in the Canon of Scripture? The Church Year is not an aggregation of single times. It is the organic order of the Divine revelation filling out the cycle of a year, and so related to the natural year as to bring into view to the best advantage the correspondence between the spiritual and natural.

Shall the Church be indifferent to the great mission of teaching the world, and let the whole matter of Scriptural instruction atomize itself according to the individual caprice of her ten thousand ministers? The church year is not a question of ritualism, nor a matter of conflict between Roman Catholics and Protestants, nor a subject of contest between High Church and Low Church. It has to do with the office of the ministry as such, in its function of unfolding the revelation of the Divine in Christ Jesus, the Lord. Its order and sense will stand or fall with the Apostles' Creed, in which it is rooted throughout, where Christ is made the determining centre, the Alpha and Omega, the express image of God's person, the brightness of God's glory, the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

We have no interest in the Church Year under any other view. If it marks not the orbit of the Sun of the Spiritual world, from whose light and heat we draw our entire supply of life-power, the very substance of our being in God, the possibility of our subsistence in time and in eternity, we care not how soon it may give place to another order entirely. All controversy, which has not for its aim a clearer and more steady view of Christ as the illuminating centre of the whole of Scripture as the very substance of the Word of God, wherever we have that word, and of all the means of grace, is in our view an abomination of desolation. E. E. H.

ART. VIII.—NATURE AND GRACE—THE CONFLICT OF AGES.

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M., MT. ALTO, PA.

THE Gospel of Christ contemplates the future conquest of the world. This naturally involves active aggression on the part of the Church, and a corresponding resistance and hostility on the part of the world. The truth, in fact, is to be propagated, and the kingdom of God established on earth, only amidst the perpetual conflict and struggle of opposing forces. This conflict, however, is not carried on between inside and outside forces only. The disturbing elements of Nature and of natural corruption exist, also, and are active within the sacred enclosure. "From the days of John the Baptist until now," says the blessed Saviour, "the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force."

This violence is not, as has sometimes been imagined, sanctioned by our Saviour, and recognized as something legitimate and right.

Rather it designates the unnatural and carnal way in which a debased and sensuous generation sought to appropriate to themselves the kingdom of God and its inestimable blessings. The crude and turbulent impulses of Nature were evidently substituted for the gracious provisions of the Gospel, as it then stood; and consequently the conversion of the ingathering multitudes was very imperfect and ephemeral. Hence the necessary and violent recoil which these early and over-zealous converts experienced when they came into closer contact with the Person and ministry of the meek and lowly Saviour—the immaculate Son of Mary. This first and violent attempt to storm the citadel of God, and appropriate the "kingdom of heaven" with its supernatural privileges and blessings, was but the rising shadow and prophecy of that endless series of similar attempts that should afterwards be witnessed in connection with the onward movements and spiritual progress of the Church militant. To trace the perpetual workings of this carnal spirit, with its endless array of hostile forces in the progress of God's kingdom, and to point out the relation it sustains to this supernatural order, will be the object of this paper.

Jesus Christ came confessedly to "make all things new." This regenerating process necessitated an early and fierce conflict with the powers of evil that met Him in the form of a sensuous and degenerate Judaism—a perpetual collision with that blind and fatal inmixing of worldly and demoralizing elements with the higher and holier elements of the Divine economy. Thus the earthly life of Christ was eventually sacrificed to the combined influence of a corrupt Judaism and a persecuting Paganism. In this terrible conflict and its fatal issue the principle of evil apparently triumphed; but the triumph of the wicked is of short duration and little account. Jesus, as the "Prince of life"—the Saviour of the world—triumphed in the midst of death, and, in the agonies of the cross, laid the foundation of a spiritual and indestructible kingdom. The atoning death of Christ was at once both the binding together of earth and heaven, and the effectual introduction of Divine and saving elements into the stream of human life and human history. Hence the violent death which ended the earthly career of our Divine Redeemer shook the kingdom of darkness to its very centre, and achieved a perpetual victory over the enemy of our fallen race. The one perennial offering of Christ on the Cross, mediated by the wickedness of men, and designed for the destruction of His cause, constitutes the firm basis of the Church on earth, and gives assurance that in due time "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ."

When the work of human redemption was consummated on the Cross, and divinely sanctioned and sealed by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, the apostles and their associates in the kingdom of God were commissioned to go forth in the name of the Crucified One, and to continue the work commenced in His own Person and ministry. They built upon the same foundation; and, in so building, they encountered like hostile forces—the same earthly elements. They entered the conflict armed with divine powers and prerogatives; and, in the full consciousnss of their higher endowments, went forth "conquering and to conquer." Being divinely illuminated they instinctively discerned the presence and fatal workings of the evil, and uniformly succeeded in mastering these hostile forces and assimilating them to the purer elements that enter into the kingdom of God. To what extent the corrupt and demoralizing spirit of the world—of unregenerate nature—was present, is seen in the extensive prevalence of the Judaizing tendencies, on the one hand, and of the docetic, speculative, or philosophizing tendencies of a semi-Christianized Paganism on the other hand. By this latter even the cardinal doctrine of the resurrection of the body was denied; while the sensuous spirit of the former sought to reduce the Divine Redeemer to the condition of a Jewish prince. To these several hostile tendencies the Apostles and early disciples opposed the doctrines of grace—the preaching of "Christ and Him crucified."

The aggressive policy of conquest and extension, inaugurated by the holy Apostles and their associates, was naturally adopted, also, and thus perpetuated by their successors in office. Their task, however, was not so easy an one as that of their immediate and divinely inspired predecessors. When the startling effects of the first shock, which Judaism and Paganism had received, had silently passed away, and things were returning again to their ordinary level, room was once more made for the incoming and free operation of the natural and perverse elements of the world. The Gospel, indeed, had made a deep and permanent impression on society : but against this progress or work of grace, the spirit of the world rebounded with redoubled force from its partial defect. Along with this natural rebound of earthly elements and their fatal inworking upon the kingdom of God, there came, also, upon the struggling Church the more potent and formidable forces of an intellectual foe. Philosophy, in the form of Neo-platonism, early arose within the bosom of the Church, and exerted its baneful influence on its doctrines and precepts. The Person of Christ, especially, his earthly life, doctrines, miracles, death, and resurrection, all came successively within the range of these bold and reckless speculations of the new philosophy. The future destiny of the saints, the resurrection of the body, and the nature of their existence in the world to come, as well as the origin and destiny of the world as a whole, also came under review, and were made to bend to the dictates of unenlightened reason and its lawless speculations. The extensive perversion of the doctrines of the Church necessitated the more careful study of the Scriptures, and the fuller and more accurate defining of doctrinal points, and so the gradual formation of the early creeds.

The state of the Church was truly critical; but her distress naturally also suggested the needed remedy. The extensive prevalence of error called forth correspondingly earnest and successful efforts for its suppression. The Gospel of Christ was found to be fully equal to the exigencies of the times. That Divine wisdom which had guided the earliest heralds of the cross, and had led them into all truth, also directed the steps of all subsequent workers in the kingdom of God. Indeed the very misfortunes of the Church—the fierce opposition of the world, and the treachery of pretended friends and their perverse and unscriptural teachings—aided in developing the spiritual resources and extraordinary endowments of the believing portion of her membership. To this very day we enjoy the sweet and precious fruits of those heroic struggles of the early Church. The dark night of heresy and schism, occasioned by these profane speculations, was succeeded by the dawn and coming glory of a brighter day. The Gospel of Christ triumphed alike over the corruptions of the world and the silly dreams and extravagant speculations of philosophy "falsely so called." But this has reference only to one side of the general evil. The effect of these absurd speculations on the practical life of the Church was equally disastrous. Docetic ideas and legions of visionary notions in the sphere of doctrine necessarily led to asceticism in practical life and conduct. Or, if these vain speculations did not originate, they at least encouraged and greatly strengthened that gloomy and forbidding view of life which afterwards led to such disastrous results. Christians were inclined to depreciate the world and its stern realities, and seek shelter, quietude, and opportunities for devotion, in the seclusion of forests and the unbroken solitude of dens and caves of the mountains. And naturally so; for if matter was deemed essentially evil, and escape from its deteriorating influence was the surest way to the cultivation of the higher life, then it was indeed highly meritorious and praiseworthy to flee from the bustle and confusion of the outside world, and to seek refuge and safety in retirement.

Such, in fact, was the direct practical effect which that dismal view of the world, and its relation to the higher life, had upon the multitude. Hence the extravagant estimate placed on the monastic profession and its dread austerities. Here then was another and more practical array of hostile elements to be met and mastered by the Gospel of the grace of God—elements that must either be subdued or prove disastrous to the cause of Christ. The Gospel of the kingdom, looking forward to the complete inward and outward conquest of the world, must needs come in living contact with its corrupt and destructive principles. And the legitimate bearers of these heavenly powers—the powers designed for the salvation of the world—were the disciples of Christ. These are "the light of the world, and the salt of the earth." Every member of the Church, therefore, that yielded to the charm of that ascetic spirit, and withdrew from the conflict of life, detracted just so much from the general current of Christian influence and spiritual power, which, in the circumstances, were needed to leaven the corrupting and heaving mass of human life.

When the dictates of duty and the instincts of nature come in conflict—when the operations and demands of divine grace and the motions of the flesh, in any form, stand opposed to each other, the higher claims of the Gospel must in all cases be responded to and obeyed. But in the case before us the preference was mostly given to the supposed claims of private devotion and individual or personal convenience. Retirement from the contagious influences of a wicked and corrupt world, and from the painful struggles of active life, was generally preferred, and even regarded as highly meritorious in the sight of God, by many of the disciples at that extraordinary period of the Church's history. But was not this practically to betray the cause of Christ, and to sacrifice duty to ease—the claims of the Gospel to the dictates of nature?

But this sensuous spirit within the bosom of the Church showed itself in another and still more objectional form—in that, namely, of a blind and senseless devotion to the sainted dead. Those heroes of faith, especially, who had suffered the agonies of martyrdom in the cause of Christ, excited the admiration and elicited the warmest devotions of the vulgar crowd. That these faithful confessors and champions in the cause of Christ should be objects of the highest regard, is not at all strange, and that some exhibitions of inordinate devotion to their persons, and extravagant laudation of their superior virtues should occur, might naturally be expected. Such regard for heroism, especially moral heroism, is found among all nations, ancient and modern. That the same should be the case with the early Christians is therefore perfectly natural; but that this merited regard for the sainted dead, and high admiration for their heroic faith and joyous confession, in prison and at the stake, should, by the common people, be carried to such extravagant lengths, and be sanctioned and applauded by their spiritual guides, is utterly inconceiveable except on the supposition that the grace of the Gospel yielded for the time being to the blind impulses of unregenerate nature. This sensuous spirit, which showed itself so potent and overwhelmingly effective in that early age of the Church, still lives, and, looming down through the ages, continues to throw its dark and ominous shadow over a large and influential portion of the Christian world. Its form may vary greatly, but its life and genius are the same. We can readily discern this dangerous spirit, as it prevails especially in Roman Catholic countries, and silently works its way to the hearts and into the devotions of the common people. Under the most genial and enticing forms it entwines itself around the hearts, and mingles with the affections of the worshipers as they kneel around the altar and offer up their daily and weekly devotions to the blessed God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now, without being willing to say that this strange fire, kindled upon the altar of the heart, does so far vitiate the devotions of God's people as to render them unacceptable to Him, we may, at least, confidently assert that any foreign matter, or discordant ingredients whatever, mingling with our worship, must, in the nature of the case, render it less pure and appropriate than it would otherwise be—that is, if it were wholly free from these foreign and disturbing elements.

There are two maxims which we consider perfectly true, and susceptible of universal application; the one is—that history continually repeats itself, and the other—that the course of history proceeds in zigzag lines. Both maxims may be applied to the view above taken of the past history of the Church, or of the progress of the Gospel in the world. Nature and grace, though under vastly different forms, proceed in parallel lines down the stream of history, and appear in continual conflict, alternately yielding the one to the superior force of the other. We are, therefore, warranted to look for the reappearance continually of the same general heresies in the different periods of the Church's history. In the more modern period of the Church, indeed, the evils which we have already had under review, may assume somewhat different aspects; but, as regards their main features, they will be the same. Both Grace and Nature operate substantially in the same way, in every age and among all classes of people.

Let us try to illustrate this thought. During the Apostolic period, the simple doctrine of "Christ and Him crucified," was preached. Little attention was paid to particular doctrinal statements, except in so far as the correction of wrong or imperfect apprehensions of particular points of doctrine became necessary from time to time. These corrections or more exact doctrinal statements are found scattered throughout the Epistles and other writings of the Apostles. This primitive mode of preaching Christ as the Redeemer of the world continued for some considerable time after the inspired teachers had passed from the stage of action. When, however, the peace of the Church was disturbed, and its safety threatened, then the early Fathers carefully formulated the acknowledged doctrines of the Church, and made adherence to them, on the part of teachers, obligatory.

So when, in the sixteenth century, the spirit of Christian liberty struggled into existence, and rose up in opposition to the spirit of bondage, which, like an incubus, lay upon the souls of men, it was natural that the emancipated spirit should revel in the comforting doctrine of the Cross—of the forgiveness of sin, and of justification by faith in the blood of Christ. This was enough for the time being. Soon, however, the exigencies of the case called for more—for the exact formulation of the doctrines of grace as then apprehended. Hence it became necessary that the intellectual faculties, as well as the simple exercise of faith, should come into play. The Reformers were compelled to state distinctly what were the accepted doctrines of grace as distinguished from the miserable excrescences of a depraved human nature. And this rational demand became the more imperative because of the wild and fanatical spirit which arose almost simultaneously with the reformatory movement, and occasioned such manifold disturbances. The kingdom of heaven was doomed once more to suffer violence, and the violent took it by force. As in the earlier ages, so here, also, there arose a motley crowd of rude and turbulent spirits, who, by their disorderly conduct, endangered the peace of the Church, and even threatened its very existence. Against the intemperate zeal and revolutionary proceedings, fomented by this evil spirit, the leaders of the reformatory movement most earnestly protested, and, by their wisdom and prudence, succeeded, in part at least, to curb its violence and thus prevent its desolating ravages. Even at the very dawn of the Reformation this violent ebullition of frenzied feeling, and the mighty inworking of unregenerate nature were experienced and seen, to mar the beautiful work of Divine grace.

These unhappy disturbances were occasioned by the presence and operation of low, sensuous elements—the ebullitions of a wild and fanatical spirit. The Church, however, was destined soon to experience evils of a more serious nature. Gradually the simple preaching of the cross, and the calm and accurate formulation of doctrinal statements, yielded to the din of war—the clash of fierce partisan strife and angry theological discussions. Party lines were being more closely drawn; and the dry, bony, and unyielding doctrinal systems rigidly enforced to the injury and annoyance of many good and earnest men. Compliance with the stern ecclesiastical enactments of the times was strictly enforced. During the dreary length of a whole century or more this harsh and merciless regime of a stiff and inflexible orthodoxy continued to afflict the struggling Church. Under its sway the mild and genial spirit of Christian piety was forced, in many cases, to succumb to the dictates of a cold and dreary intellectualism; while the teachings of the blessed Gospel itself were twisted and tortured into every imaginable shape, to suit the peculiar whims of stern and bigoted ecclesiastical zealots. No wonder that the free spirit of the gospel should rise up and rebel against this oppressive system, especially when the earnest inner life which distinguished the Reformers and their immediate successors, had well-nigh disappeared, and left the Church next to a lifeless corpse.

This deplorable state of the Church in that age of spiritual stagnation and moribund confessionalism, called forth an equally dangerous extreme on the opposite side—namely Pietism. As over against the cold and lifeless objectivism then prevailing, the pietists very properly insisted on subjective religion—the inner life of the soul. So far as this movement, in the seventeenth century, was a protest against a lifeless formalism in the Church, it was perfectly legitimate; but, as it usually happens in such cases, the movement soon degenerated into a species of gloomy fanaticism, and fomented endless disorders in the Church at the time. The pious Spener and his genial companions at first controlled and held in check this movement, and, for some time, kept it within the bounds of reason and sobriety. But others, possessed of a more ardent temperament, and hurried along by the wild spirit of the age, could not brook restraint, and soon carried things to the most extravagant lengths—ending in all sorts of excess. Grace yielded to the power of nature under its most dangerous and ungovernable form. A gloomy fanaticism usurped the place of rational piety, and a stubborn willfulness, often rude and unyielding, effectually displaced the mild and merciful spirit of the Gospel. Soon the bitter fruits ot this excessively subjective movement openly appeared. The spirit of the age, unwilling any longer to submit to wholesome restraint, and terribly demoralized by the absence of a living and rational piety in the Church, now boldly launched forth and landed in the cold and dreary regions of a supremely *irrational* Rationalism. Here truly the natural and perverted reason had full and undisputed sway. The authority of Divine Revelation was utterly repudiated except in so far as it admitted of a rational interpretation in the low and jejune sense of these radical reformers of the Church and her doctrines. During one more long and dreary century the Church was fearfully oppressed, and compelled to submit to the stern and heartless regime of the bald and now almost universally enthroned abstract understanding. The supernatural was required to yield to the authority of the natural—the Divine to the human!

Blessed be God that a better and brighter day has dawned upon the Church of Europe. A more lovely and genial piety now occupies the place of the rude rationalistic spirit which, until but half a century ago, afflicted the poor, bleeding churches of the fatherland. Long may they continue to enjoy the blessed liberty wherewith Christ has made them free!

Leaving the foreign churches for the present, we shall turn our attention to what is transpiring nearer home. Here we find substantially the same processes going forward as in the churches abroad, only under somewhat different aspects. The elements of our American piety have all been imported from the old country during the last few centuries. The numerous emigrants from the continent of Europe, as well as from Great Britain, would naturally bring with them the same form of Christianity to which they had been accustomed in their former homes. Thus the religious ideas and practices of the Old World would naturally be transferred to their homes in the New. May we not, then, suppose that from these similar religious elements precisely the same practical results will be evolved, here as there, except in so far as they may be incidentally affected by modifying influences brought to bear upon them from without. This fact would naturally lead us to expect the same fruits to appear in this country as were seen to flow from these principles on the soil of Europe. While, therefore, the grace of God might be expected to work out all the blessed results which were seen to accompany the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the holy sacraments in the Old World, we would be warranted to look, also, for the certain appearance of the tares—the evil fruits—which there sprung from the in-mixing of any sinful, carnal, or earthly elements.

This expectation would be perfectly natural under the circumstances. While, then, we are allowed to rejoice in the prosperity of the Church in this country, we should not be unmindful of the dangers which may threaten it, especially in the future. To many good and earnest men, as is well known, the present appearance of things is not just the most promising. Our American Christianity is mainly remarkable for its prevailingly subjective character, for its excessive freedom, and its independence of the outward means of grace—in other words, for its unchurchly and unsacramental character. Indeed, the latter characteristics are very generally regarded with feelings of profound suspicion. The boasted *superiority* of our popular piety confessedly consists, to a very large extent, in its spiritualistic and intensely subjective character—its independence of outward forms. Some good men, indeed, regard this peculiarity as its highest recommendation. Other men equally good, we think, regard the matter in question in an exactly opposite light.

Look at the present religious status of this country. The interests of religion are carried forward almost exclusively on what may be termed the high-pressure system—that is by the use of special and extraordinary means, and in connection with a large amount of excitement or animal feeling. This, we think, can be asserted without the least injustice to the parties implicated. Indeed, many very excellent men would take it as an insult to be told that this was not the best or even *only* mode of advancing successfully the cause and kingdom of Christ in the world. The free and almost universal use of the so-called "ANXIOUS-BENCH" and other kindred appliances, in conducting religious meetings—especially those usually called "revival meetings"—will, we think, fully justify the assertion which we have ventured to make. Now, without presuming to sit in judgment upon this particular system of operations, we may confidently assert that in meetings of this character the success depends very largely upon the operation of purely human elements—in some cases almost wholly so. The preaching, the praying, and the singing are generally of such a character as strongly to affect and move the feelings, and to create an unnatural excitement. The purely natural elements come in, and occupy, to a large extent, the place, and perform the functions which belong exclusively to the Divine Spirit. This is the most discouraging feature in this popular and bewitching system. The same peculiarity gave to the Pietism of the last and preceding century its attractive character, and clothed it for a time with such extraordinary power and popularity. But the very same peculiarity also contributed largely to its subsequent decline, and, in connection with the rationalistic tendencies of the age, conducted it fully into the current of that muddy and turbulent stream. Prof. Semler, who was among the latest representatives of Pietism, was also one of the earliest of the modern rationalists.

That our American New-measure piety, with its intensely subjective character, its generally low estimate of outward divine ordinances, and its disposition to lay so much stress upon feeling, is in great danger of running itself out into rationalistic tendencies, no one acquainted with the past history of the Church can possibly deny. So long, indeed, as the first glow of this species of piety continues unabated, there is not so much danger; but let a general decline of religious interest supervene, and the door is at once fully open for the intrusion of the enemy. The system of thought which underlies that species of piety is constitutionally weak and faulty, and has an innate tendency to run out into spiritual anarchy and lawlessness.

A moment's reflection on the past history of the American Churches will convince any one of the general correctness of our position. Puritanism was the predominant religion of the New England States. No one can for a moment question the earnest Christian character of those good men who settled that interesting portion of our country. They have always been justly regarded as among the most intelligent, pious, and enterprising portion of our population. Their zeal for the public welfare was always equal to their piety. Nothing, indeed, so far as we can see, could possibly be wanting to preserve New England Puritanism in its integrity down to the latest generations; and yet no portion of our country has suffered so much from the prevalence of rationalistic principles, and aberrations of all descriptions, as New England. There may, indeed, be other causes calculated to account for this strange phenomenon ; but, to our own mind, the excessively subjective character of their piety is abundantly sufficient for the extensive prevalence of rationalism, in the form, especially, of Unitarianism and kindred heresies.

Some good and pious people may perhaps object to the freedom we have taken with several of our popular systems of religious belief and practice, from the fact that each one of the different phases of Christianity noticed has excellencies which we are bound to honor, and that with almost every system of religious faith are identified men of fine parts and excellent Christian character, whose feelings should be sacredly regarded. Most assuredly we are bound to recognize Christian piety wherever found, and to esteem and honor all the friends of Jesus, of every name. But this duty, confessedly important, does not debar us from being loyal to the truth ; nor does it prevent us from sounding the alarm whenever we encounter error, or feel confident that there is danger at hand. We are bound to honor the TRUTH above everything else, and to maintain it at all hazards. No personal consideration whatever should induce us to shrink from any task which duty to God and His kingdom may impose upon us. To do so, knowingly, would betray an unpardonable weakness and criminal want of fidelity to the cause of truth and righteousness. Besides, we should not be so excessively sensitive on this point, as we ALL are alike subject to imperfections ; and a confession and faithful exposure of our own infirmities may serve to shield others from danger, and save them from death. Of all the lessons which we learn, those acquired by the study of actual history are the most salutary and effective.

What, then, are the particular lessons to be derived from the present brief historical survey. Chiefly the following, namely, that, as in the case of individual Christians, so in reference to the whole Church or any single part of it, perfection is wholly out of the question ; that wherever the grace of the blessed Gospel is operative, there, too, the corrupt elements of the "flesh" make themselves felt ; that in each particular age of the church we find errors and sins peculiar to the circumstances of that age ; that, generally speaking, where the Divine presence is most deeply felt, there also the workings of evil are the most startling; and, finally, that our only safety, both as regards ourselves and the Church of God, lies in a prudent distrust of our own resources, and in close adherence to the blessed Gospel and its infallible teachings, seeking, at the same time, earnestly and believingly, the guidance of the Divine Spirit!

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

HYMNS FOR THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, No. 907 Arch street.

This is the new selection of hymns prepared by a committee of the Eastern Synod, including what is now the Potomac Synod, of the Reformed Church. It was prepared by permission of the General Synod, which allowed the Church East and West to publish and use such selection in connection with their respective liturgies. It contains 486 hymns and 21 doxologies. The advantages which it possesses over the old hymn book are many. In that hymn book there is a number of hymns that are inferior and were seldom used. These are now left out. In place of them quite a number of first-class hymns are given that were not in the old book. Rock of Ages, O Sacred Head now wounded, Come ye Disconsolate, Jerusalem the Golden, and many other well-known hymns are here given which are not found in the old book. Besides, there are many excellent ones from the Latin-Church hymns that are consecrated by the ages. The one by Dr. Higbee, Thy glory Thou didst manifest, will live. We would suggest the omission of the italicizing of the two words in the 1st and 2d stanzas in the next edition, as being unusual in hymns. Dr. Harbaugh's hymn, Jesus! I live to Thee, is worthy the place it occupies also.

The arrangement according to the Church Year is a great improvement. It is a great convenience, as well as a guide for finding the proper hymns for any Sunday, while there may be full freedom in selecting at times from other portions, especially where the hymns are used during the week. We do not regard this as a final hymn book for the Reformed Church. It has defects as well as high virtues. But we feel persuaded that it meets a present want; and when the time comes, if it will come, when the whole Church itself wishes to unite in preparing a hymn book, we feel assured that this will be one of the best helps. The committee deserve the thanks of the Church for their arduous labors and the success which has attended them.

ADDITIONS TO SCHAFF'S DEUTSCHES GESANGBUCH. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. J. Kohler. 1875.

These additional hymns are published in flexible covers, in two sizes, to suit the two editions of the hymn book. They include translations from several English hymns—Nearer, my God, to Thee, Rock of Ages, Just as I am, etc.

ASSYRIAN DISCOVERIES: An account of Explorations and Discoveries on the site of Nineveh, during 1873 and 1874. By George Smith, of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum, Author of "History of Assurbanipal," etc., etc,, with illustrations. New York. Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1875.

This is a large-sized volume of about 450 pages, printed on the best paper and handsomely bound, in every way worthy, in mechanical execution, of the important contents which it presents to the public. The enterprise of making these explorations was started by the proprietors of the "Daily Telegraph" newspaper of London. It is hardly necessary to refer to the interest that attaches to the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris, which, with the land of Palestine, furnishes traditions, history and monuments of the utmost importance, especially to the Christian world. "It is the home of man's earliest traditions, the place where Eden was supposed to have been; some of its cities are stated to be older than the Flood; it is the land of the Deluge and of the tower of Babel, and it is the birthplace of the great race of Israel, which has played so important a part in the religious history of the world."

The excavations on the sites of the buried cities of Assyria was commenced by M. Botta, French consul at Mosul in 1842. These were continued by Mr. Layard in 1845. Then came the decyphering of the inscriptions which have thrown so much light on the history, language, manners, and customs of ancient Assyria and Babylonia, by Sir Henry Rawlinson and others. The author of this interesting volume, made two visits to this Eastern country, and although the time spent was comparatively brief, yet he succeeded in making many interesting discoveries of inscriptions. These are given in this volume, accompanied with some fine illustrations. The legend of the Flood is remarkable in its coincidence with the account in the Bible. We merely add that while the work of examining and translating these inscriptions is the work of scholars only, yet the account of their discovery and the use made of them is of interest to the general reader, and this volume is prepared in order to spread information and awaken interest in the work of extending these explorations.

HOURS IN A LIBRARY: By Leslie Stephen. New York. Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1875.

A republication of Articles which have appeared in the "Cornhill Magazine," "Frazer's Magazine," and the "Fortnightly Review." They embrace chapters on De Foe's Novels, Richardson's Novels, Pope as a Moralist, Mr. Elwin's Edition of Pope, some words about Sir Walter Scott, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Balzac's Novels, and De Quincey. The Magazines in which these essays first appeared furnish a guarantee of their literary merit. Nor does it detract at all from their interest that they are republished in this volume. Rather this also is a proof of their sterling value. They belong to literature, and are not affected by the changes of the times. The authors and writings they criticise live on in the world of literature, and will be studied and read with no less interest in years to come than in years past, for a true work of literature belongs to all time. So far as we have looked into these essays, they evince on the part of their author a mastery of his subject, and present a clear and forcible style. It is a suitable volume especially for the libraries of students and literary societies.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND FIRST EMPIRE: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH. By William O'Connor Morris, sometime scholar of Oriel College, Oxford. With an appendix upon the Bibliography of the subject and a course of study by Hon. Andrew D. White, LL. D., President of Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co.

Another volume of the series designated Epochs of History, to which we have referred in notices of former volumes of the same series.

Those who cannot take the time, or have not the desire, to read the volumes of Thiers, or to cypher out the hyeroglyphics of what is called "the prose poem" of Carlyle, will find the subject presented here in small compass. The matter is worked up with great ability, so as to present the subject as a complete whole. The style is animated, and carries the reader along with increasing interest from the beginning to the close.

For the benefit of those who may wish to go into a more extensive study of the subject, President White furnishes a valuable Appendix and Bibliography, giving a list: 1. Of the general historical works; 2. Special and collateral treatises; 3. Historical essays and lectures; 4. Memoirs and correspondence; 5. Newspapers; 6. Illustrative material; 7. Maps. Then follow sketches of courses of reading. The more we see of this historical library the more we are disposed to commend it. The volumes are presented in that beautiful style for which the house of Scribner, Armstrong & Co. is distinguished.

SEEKING AND FINDING. From the German. By Lewis Henry Steiner. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, 907 Arch street. 1875.

This work has already become widely known in the Reformed Church by its publication as a serial in the *Messenger*. It is eminently worthy of being issued now in book form. It gives, we think, a somewhat exceptional experience, but yet one from which much that is valuable may be learned by every one. Ordinarily the experience of Christian life flows in a more even and placid stream. Perhaps the wide separation between the spiritual condition at confirmation and that which followed in the subject of this volume, is more common in Germany, where all are confirmed at a certain age, than would be the case in the Protestant churches in this country. In this respect, the experience seems to be exceptional and abnormal. There ought to be an even unfolding of Christian experience from confirmation forward. But we know that with many this is not the case. Perhaps too much stress is laid on feeling, and here and there the experience seems somewhat sentimental.

But, with all, the book is deeply earnest, and all stress centres on the unfolding of the Christian life instead of worldly interests, as is too often the case with such works. It touches on the tender sentiment of love; but does not end in a marriage. The translation is all that might be expected from such an accurate and accomplished scholar as Dr. Steiner.

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE DUKE OF NORFOLK on occasion of Mr. Gladstone's Recent Expostulation. By John Henry Newman, D. D., of the Oratory. New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 9 Warren street. 1875.

THE VATICAN DECREES IN THEIR BEARING ON CIVIL ALLEGIANCE. By Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster. New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 9 Warren street. 1875.

THE TRUE AND THE FALSE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPES. A controversial reply to Dr. Schulte. By Dr. Joseph Fessler, late Bishop of St. Polten, in Austria, and Secretary General of the Vatican Council. New York: The Catholic Publication Society, No. 9 Warren street. 1875.

Besides the above replies to Mr. Gladstone, which have been sent to us by the publishers, there are, Bishop Ullathorne on the same subject, Bishop Vaughan on the same, Lord Robert Montagu on the same, etc., all published by the same Society. The number of replies is perhaps eighteen or twenty, all to Mr. Gladstone's first pamphlet. He has published another, answering his critics, to which there will no doubt be other rejoinders. The discussion is a very serious and earnest one, of marked ability, and conducted thus far in a gentlemanly and amiable spirit.

The author of the first pamphlet named is one of the first writers in the English language. He is one of the first minds of the age. He has a most kind and amiable spirit, and, as we think, too much of the spirit of Protestantism to feel fully at home in Ultramontanism. He is eminently conscientious, and so simple and honest in stating his convictions that he exposes himself to attacks from Roman Catholics. His theory of conscience, we feel assured, is very far from squaring with the Jesuit theory, which now rules the Roman Catholic Church. So also he admits quite too much to please that Order. After going over the case of Honorius, "whose condemnation by anathema in the 6th Œcumenical Council," he grants, "is certainly a strong *prima facie* argument against the Pope's doctrinal infallibility," he concludes that "at the utmost, it only decides that Honorius in his own person was a heretic, which is inconsistent with no Catholic doctrine; but we may rather hope and believe that the anathema fell, not upon him, but upon his letters in their objective sense, he not intending personally what his letters legitimately expressed." His concessions in the case of Galileo and the St. Bartholomew massacre would hardly be acceptable to the *Catholic World*, published in New York. Indeed Dr. Newman's pamphlet has been pretty sharply criticised by the Roman Catholics themselves.

Archbishop Manning's pamphlet breathes a very different spirit. He is politician as well as churchman and theologian, not as vigorous a thinker as Newman, nor of such childlike spirit, but speaking as an executive with greater severity towards his opponents. Manning argues where Newman concedes. Dr. Fessler devotes the larger portion of his pamphlet to show that none of the historical examples brought forward by Schulte are included in the sphere of the Pope's infallibility.

We do not propose to go into a notice of this controversy at length, but merely add a few points, just as they come forward.

I. In regard to the Bull *unam sanctam* of Boniface VIII.

Dr. Manning employs a good deal of space, some twenty pages directly, to this Bull. He says, "I have affirmed that the relations of the Catholic Church to the Civil Powers are fixed primarily by the Divine constitution of the Church and of the Civil Society of men. But it is also true that these relations have been declared by the Church in acts and decrees, *which are of infallible authority. Such, for instance, is the Bull of Boniface VIII., unam sanctam.*" We italicize as above. Then the writer goes on to defend the doctrines set forth in this Bull as the infallible teaching of the Church.

But, now, when Dr. Fessler comes to this subject in his criticism of Schulte, he maintains that there is only one sentence in this Bull which can be regarded as an infallible dogmatic definition, viz: the closing words: "And this we declare, we say, we define, and we pronounce, that it is necessary for the salvation of every human creature that he should be subject to the Roman Pontiff. These words, and only these words, are the definition *de fide* of the Bull *unam sanctam.* All the rest of the foregoing, after the very first words, which lay down an acknowledged article of faith as a basis, is a partly theological, partly canonical exposition of the relative positions of Church and State, made after the fashion of viewing such matters then in vogue; but it constitutes no dogmatic definition at all, &c."

This is the way Dr. Fessler answers the case of Boniface. But if he is right, then Dr. Manning does not seem to apprehend the case aright when he devotes so long an argument to support the whole of this Bull as an *ex cathedra* and infallible doctrine of the Pope. This is only one example to show that it requires great knowledge and skill of theologians to determine what is *ex cathedra* and infallible in the utterance of Popes, and that even they are not always agreed on the subject. This renders this doctrine of infallibility of but poor practical account for the millions of unlettered laymen.

For these millions of laymen a large portion of the teachings and definitions of the Church is a mere dead letter. And this shows the folly of adding the damnatory clause to all these decrees, beginning with the Athanasian Creed. There is, we know, a way of explaining that clause, as referring not to the detailed items of that creed, but to the faith as a whole which it embodies. But what then are we to make of all the *anathemas* affixed to the decrees of Councils, down to those of Trent and the Vatican? It may be said that all that is required of the people who never know what these decrees are, is, that they have a passive faith, that they do not contradict them. Well, then it is, after all, just about the same as if a Protestant would say, I believe all that is in the Bible, no matter whether he knows what is in it or not. This is a kind of faith, we grant, and has its value; but it is not the faith that saves, it is not the faith which apprehends Jesus Christ as the object of faith. Such dogmatic definitions are not the condition of salvation. The idea of condemning Pope Honorius I. to eternal condemnation because he thought (whether as an individual or *ex cathedra*) that there was only one energy or will in

Christ! How many Christians, who believe in Christ as the God-man, would be unable to tell what the doctrine of the Church is in regard to the two wills of Christ! Must they be anathematized for that?

II. There seems to be an effort in these pamphlets to explain away the meaning of the temporal power claimed by the Pope. But this cannot be done in the face of history. The iron rule enforced by the Papacy over the state during the middle ages appears on almost every page of their history. It was not merely the right to discipline a king, being a member of the Catholic Church, as well as a subject, if he sinned, that was exercised, but to depose him from office, to release his subjects from their allegiance, and give over his realm to a foreign invader. Just here the Ultramontane theory contradicts itself. That theory teaches that civil rulers receive their office from God through the people. Then the people only have the right, under certain circumstances, to take the office away. But the Popes have claimed and exercised the right, time and again, to depose civil rulers.

And what shall we say of the exegesis of Boniface VIII. when, in his Bull *unam sanctam*, he argues from Scripture in support of his theory of the two swords, that when Christ said to the disciples, "how many swords have ye?" and they replied, "two," He said "it is enough," the Saviour meant to teach that the Church has these two swords committed to her, the temporal and the spiritual, and should use them? Is that infallible interpretation? If so, then when Peter used a sword, and the Lord rebuked him, saying, they that take the sword shall perish by the sword, it must mean something too. Does it mean that when the Church attempts to use the sword of temporal power it shall perish by that sword?

III. Nor do we think the argument has much force, that this temporal power was wielded only over Catholic nations, and by consent of those nations, and that the Catholic Church does not claim the same power over Protestant nations and rulers. This argument is made great account of. It is said the Roman Hierarchy will not attempt now what it did in the middle ages. Therefore there need be no fear.

In the first place it is not true that the Popes exercised this power only by consent of the nations. That consent was not asked. It was claimed that subjects and rulers were alike under the power of the Pope in temporals as well as spirituals. The Pope never asked the people of England, nor the Barons of England, whether they consented to the deposition of King John. He would have considered it the height of presumption and wickedness in them to even think he ought to ask that consent.

In the second place the Pope claims, as we know, that all baptized persons, whether Catholics or Protestants, are his subjects.

If he had the power, he would be just as much in duty bound to preach a crusade for the suppression of the Protestants as for the suppression of the Albigenses. The Middle Ages are regarded by all these writers as the golden age, the age of faith; and if the Roman Church had the power it would bring them back again. The Catholics of Great Britain obtained certain privileges under the English government, under a pledge given by the high exclesiastical authorities of that realm. They now break their engagement on the ground that no one was entitled to speak for the Pope. The Jesuits in Germany were plotting against the integrity of the German empire. Is there not reason for those nations to be on their guard against a power which for ages has held sway over civil governments, and wielded that power often in a tyrannical spirit?

We do not mean to justify the condition of things in England and Germany, in the matter of the relation of the Church and State there. We do not believe the Church ought to be under the power of the State. Bismarck may be wrong in his policy of exercising rule over the Church. But, if Romanism wishes to enjoy its rights with other Christian churches in England, Germany, and the United States, it must stop meddling in politics. "My kingdom is not of this world."

SEMI-CENTENNIAL REGISTER OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH, Lancaster, Pa. 1825–1875. Lancaster, Pa: Press of the Inquirer Printing and Publishing Company. 1875.

This Register, which has been before the Church for some time, contains a complete roll of the members of the Faculty, the members of the Board of Visitors and the Board of Trustees; a catalogue of all the Graduates; a catalogue of the Professors and Students now composing the Institution; an outline of its history, and a brief representation of its present theological status, and a necrological register.

As might be expected, the catalogue of the graduates is not in all cases correct. It contains the names of some who graduated in the College but studied theology privately, and of some who were in the Seminary but a short time and completed their theological studies privately. These latter are given as graduates because the rule in regard to the time of study in the Seminary has varied at different times, though it would be more proper to say *graduates and students.* These inaccuracies, so far as they come to the knowledge of those who have the matter in charge, will no doubt be corrected should another edition be issued. The Register contains 63 pages, and is issued in good style.

The introduction presents a brief history of the institution, but which from its brevity could not state many facts in this history which would be interesting to the Church. It states in the main correctly, we think, what has been the central principle in the teaching of the Seminary. This teaching has a history. In one sense it has not been at all times just the same. To be living and moving it could not be the same. It has had to assert itself against different prevailing errors, and hence it has made certain phases of truth more prominent at one time than at another. At one time the *Church* Question was specially emphasized over against prevailing Puritanic unchurchliness. Then as against the pretensions of Rome it has held up the relation of Christ to the believer. Now it antagonized sharply while it was securing for itself an independent status; then again it revealed a milder attitude towards surrounding denominations. But all through it has held its teaching to the central principle of all true theology, the person of Christ the source of salvation for man, and the absolute revelation of God to man. We think the writer of this introduction has succeeded well in bringing so much information within so brief a compass. The Register will accomplish much good, and deserves a wide circulation in the Church.

THE MORAL SYSTEM, WITH AN HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL INTRODUCTION. Having special reference to Bishop Butler's "Analogy." Designed as a Text Book for Academies and Colleges. By E. H. Gillett, Professor in the University of the City of New York; author of "Life and Times of John Huss;" "God in Human Thought," etc. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Company. 1874.

This work, which is written in an earnest vein, is intended to supplant Butler's Analogy. Rather, perhaps we should say, it is designed to present the general subject with which that work is concerned, with the improvements which the author furnishes. He thinks Butler does not sufficiently bring out the argument for immortality derived from the consideration of the moral system. Butler's argument was merely negative, leaving the burden of proof to rest with his opponents. In fact, he assumed the doctrine of a future life. But inasmuch as that doctrine has been called in question by the unbelief of the present time, the author thinks the argument ought now to be pressed on its positive side, which he accordingly does in the body of this work. But we must say on this point that the doctrine of immortality, apart from revelation, does not amount to much. It was handled about as well by Plato as it is possible for the human mind to argue it. That argument is valuable in its place, as forming a presumption in favor of revelation. But we dare not overlook the fact that life and immortality *have been brought to light* only in Jesus Christ, who is the resurrection and the life. The future life has no objective validity out of Christ. It is only a speculation. When moral philosophy attempts to say what it is, it is in the dark. So also the argument for the resurrection drawn from nature, which the author advances, has meaning only for those who accept the teachings of Christianity on this subject.

Again, he says, Butler assumes the existence of God. This, he thinks, requires new treatment, because modern scepticism calls in question Butler's data. But here also the same difficulty arises. Can we better the case by bringing forward *a posteriori* arguments to prove the being of God? We think not. The idea of God is a fact of consciousness, and the argument is just as strong when made to rest here, as to attempt to adduce it by reasoning from the moral system.

And just here lies our criticism of the author's work. There is certainly room for constructing a system of moral philosophy, without basing it directly on revelation. There is a distinction between Christian Ethics and Philosophical Ethics, just as there is a distinction between the philosophical treatment of psychology and Biblical psychology. But in this work the two are mixed together. Or rather, the author undertakes too much in his moral system. His chapters on the being and character of the Moral System, The Future Life, Probation, etc., carry him beyond the sphere of reason. It is only by revelation that we can know who God is, and the nature of the future life.

If the work is designed to promote belief in a true moral system without assuming the truth of Christianity, we doubt very much whether it will accomplish its purpose. The higher light here must aid the lower, not *vice versa.* Nature cannot illumine revelation, and revelation illumines nature. Let Christianity furnish us its light, let us accept it, and then we can still study nature in its own sphere, but we will be able to understand it. The natural finds its end in the supernatural, and the end here explains the beginning.

The work we are noticing contains many excellent things, but it is hardly complete enough to take its place among systems of moral philosophy. The topics treated are too few to cover the ground. There is no treatment of the nature of the moral law, nor of the principle of virtue. Even the chapter on social organization leaves out much that is necessary to complete that subject. The organization of society is looked at too much from an external point of view.

This work seems to us to move in the line of thought adopted in England in opposition to Deism. The German method has been very different. While they confine themselves to the sphere of consciousness and reason in constructing a philosophical system of ethics, yet they do not think of keeping out the light of Christianity. The idea of the Trinity and the Incarnation they find to be in accord with reason. It is true that Kant sought to draw a line between the two, but in the rise of the great systems which came after him, the Scriptures and revelations are freely used, while at the same time they distinguish between the philosophical and the strictly theological. In studying philosophy and constructing philosophical systems, we ought to do so as Christians, and not as heathens.

The relation between morality and religion, or Christianity, is one upon which we cannot now enter. What is the sphere of philosophical ethics, and Christian ethics? Where and how do they connect? What is their relation to each other? These are questions, the treatment of which would require more space than is here left us, even had we the ability to give a satisfactory answer, which we do not claim.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1875.

ART. I.—THE FIRST GREAT CONFLICT OF CHRISTIANITY WITH ROME.*

IN directing attention to this theme, we are aware that it relates to a remote past, to an age with which most of the readers of this REVIEW must be familiar. Yet it involves interests and issues of such great significance for *all* time, that it may well engage earnest and *repeated* consideration. The theme, although recalling the past, is of present import and application. The conflict of Christianity with its numerous enemies *now*, however different it may be in form and accidental circumstances, arises from the same profound antagonism between the Church and the kingdoms of this world as meets us in those earlier ages, when Christ was nailed to the cross, and His apostles suffered martyrdom, and the " garments of saints were rolled in blood." It may be possible indeed, that many Stephens may yet be stoned, and many heroic apostles yet be imprisoned and slain, before the glory of the Lord shall fully come.

---

*Compare Dollinger, " The Gentile and the Jew," translated by H. Darnell.
Charles Merivale, B. D., "The Conversion of the Roman Empire."
A. F. Ozanam, "La civilisation au Cinquième Siècle," a work, which, in breadth of information, clearness of thought, and eloquence of expression, has, in our judgment, been rarely equaled. Translated by Ashley C. Glyn, B. A.

If, therefore, we can bring into clear view the main features of the first conflict of Christianity with Rome, referring it to its proper ground, and determining its true nature, we shall have made it possible the better to survey the present struggle of the Church with the world as in the light of a past experience, and be able perhaps, to catch, in our comprehensive glance, the two great contending forces of history, whose battle field is ever in the very bosom of our life, whose collision is the burden of the ages, and whose issue will be fully revealed only when He shall be fully revealed among men, who is the centre and hinge of the whole movement from its beginning to its close, and at whose first coming in the manger of Bethlehem, the angels chanted glory and peace, and the star-led wizards came bending in adoration, and at whose second coming at the general assize of the world, the same angels, and all the redeemed hosts, shall exultingly shout, "*Alleluia: salvation, and glory, and honor, and power unto the Lord our God.*"

We cannot, however, speak directly of the conflict without first measuring the strength and resources of the two forces challenging each other, and marshaling their opposing battalions upon the field of this high warfare. And here, inasmuch as we have to do with religious as well as with political life, we must be allowed to include resources not physical and visible merely, but principalities and powers, and thrones and dominions of an invisible hierarchy—powers more than earthly, both of darkness and of light—the one "hovering on wing under the cope of hell," the other in glittering rank of "helmed cherubim and sworded seraphim."

Indeed no crisis of history, no great central epoch of the world's life, can fail to bring into action the whole array of forces "physical and metaphysical;" and unless we have eyes to see, and ears to hear realities within the spiritual realm, we shall at best but grope in darkness, never catching the light which guides the ages, nor hearing the voice which breaks forever the silence of their night.

In the small town of Latium, on the banks of the Tiber, a handful of stalwart men, shepherds and brigands, gathered from various sections (*colluvies*), formed a community which, during some seven centuries of development up to the time of which we speak, became a kingdom in whose hands was the mastery of the historical world. With an ambition never satisfied with victory, and a latent energy never exhausted by toil, and a spirit never discouraged by defeat, this community at last reared the walls of lofty Rome, and made it the proud centre of the world. The sweep of this immense kingdom extended from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, from the mouth of the Rhine along the banks of the Danube, southward to the burning deserts of Africa and the cataracts of the Nile.

This vast territory contained a population probably of more than a hundred million souls, held under the iron control of Roman law, yet varying in language and habits and religion, so far as variance here was allowed by the will of the Emperor. At stations or centres, scattered throughout this empire, were Roman officials and Roman legions, guiding and governing the whole in the interest of the Eternal City. The standing army has been estimated at six hundred thousand (but upon any great emergency this could be increased indefinitely), and it was led by generals of whom the world was proud. From this boundless field, thus guarded and garrisoned, revenues and treasures almost incalculable kept flowing into Rome.

Rome, however, was not only the centre of such a vast population, and of such wide-spread military garrisons, and the source of that imperial law which ruled far and near, but she was at the same time the centre of a civilization at once the most polished and refined which the world had ever witnessed. Her orators and statesmen rivaled those who had made the Béma of Athens immortal—her historians, in elegance of diction and comprehensiveness of information, were unsurpassed—her poets imitated the Greek, it is true, yet with a freshness and warmth of genius which have made Virgil and Horace for ages the delight of mankind. Here gathered the artful politician, flattering the fickle crowd; here the man of wealth, with granaries well stored from Lybian threshing floors; here the peasant who had tilled with care his paternal acres; here the merchant, eager of gain, leaving his villa to refit his shattered barks; here the man of leisure, enjoying old Massic with his polished companions; here the veteran soldier who had rejoiced in the confused din of trumpet and clarion; here, in fine, congregated every element of earthly pomp and glory which made Rome the great metropolis of the world, wielding a colossal power, the fear and admiration of all the provinces, and beyond her frontiers, of all the outlying barbaric world, east, north and south.

This is but a brief and imperfect survey of the physical strength and resources of Rome.

Not far off, in the southeastern corner of this vast empire, under the severe subjection of Roman officials and legions, lived a few poor and despised representatives of the royal house of David. In Nazareth, a small town, quite unknown by the gay throngs of imperial Rome, and disregarded by Jerusalem, if not despised, in quiet poverty, solaced, no doubt, by the glorious hopes which the treasured prophecies of other ages kept enkindled within the heart, dwelt one of the descendants of David, a virgin, espoused to a carpenter. Where she was taught, or how she was trained, we know not, save from unreliable tradition. Mysterious silence enshrouds her earliest years, and the band of inspiration seems to have been forbidden to withdraw the veil.

She claimed to have been saluted in some hour of her retired meditation by a heavenly archangel, with that mysterious "*Ave Maria*," the echoes of which at least still linger in the world. She regarded herself as overshadowed by the Highest, and in her exultant *magnificat* proclaimed herself as the one in whom the long glorious lines of prophecy came to a convergent focal point of fulfillment, and that all nations would call her blessed. Of these strange claims the historical world, of course, knew nothing. Joseph himself was incredulous; and yet these claims were to be maintained not only on the strength of her word, but on the testimony which the fact itself might give; and this of course, upon the birth of Jesus, would have to be such as would accredit a God, for he was claimed by the angelic salutation to be God with us and a Saviour. The sublime boldness of this claim is only equaled by the seemingly utter impossibility of realizing it. As time went on, however, her strange tale received strange corroborations. While she was watching her child in the manger, the shepherds came to her, announcing that the hillsides of Judea did blaze with heavenly light, and the air did become vocal with the celestial chorus of rejoicing angels; and then again subsequently the star-led wizards of the East came bending in adoration, with gifts of gold and frankincense and myrrh.

Yet all this was so confined and transient as not to disturb at all the vast ocean of world movements around the palace halls of Rome; the theatres and busy marts of the world's metropolis knew nothing of the lowly manger, or of the mysterious babe that rested there wrapped in swaddling bands. And even had the tale been told the polished Roman would only have smiled, incredulous of the strange religious hallucination of the fanatic East.

Some eleven years of silence follow, unbroken by a breath from the heavenly world, so far as we know. Nothing indicates the presence of any new power in the world, unless it be the words spoken in the Temple when the aged Simeon took the child in his arms and sang his swan-like "nunc dimittis." The old Roman Empire went on, multiplying its splendor, and increasing its luxurious wealth, with no thought or dream that the foundations of a kingdom which should witness its ruins, and wield its colossal power among the nations during centuries to come, was germinantly present already in the little child who walked the fields of Galilee.

The preceding silence is broken in the Temple, when the heavenward aspiring child, now twelve years of age, said to his mother: "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" But his parents and the astonished priests understood him not. The mother pondered in her heart the mysterious words; but this momentary glimpse of heavenly light was quickly withdrawn, and the child went down to Nazareth and helped Joseph at his trade, in full and dutiful subjection. Some seventeen years or more of silence follow, and the Roman Empire still holds the world within its grasp; and from the four quarters of the earth, the throng of business and pleasure converges towards the Tiber. Nothing seems calculated to inspire even a hope that a new and heavenly mystery is in the world, or that Jehovah is making bare his arm in the sight of the nations. Jupiter Capitolinus securely guards the Eternal City, and the Imperial Cæsar continues the Pontifex Maximus of the world.

The child Jesus grows to manhood, and shortly before he starts upon any public work or office in the Jewish world, a heralding Prophet, the Eremite of the desert, clothed in coarse robes of haircloth, and fasting, proclaims, as a voice crying in the wilderness, that the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Many of the Jews are aroused by the earnest ascetic, and flock to his baptism, and at last to the banks of the Jordan Jesus, now some thirty years of age, comes to be baptized. The prophet, who had thundered into the ears of the proud and haughty Pharisees the necessity of repentance, now stands back in wondering humility, and begs rather to be baptized of Jesus than to baptize Him whose shoes' latchet he was not worthy to unloose.

Jesus is baptized, and again for a moment the spiritual world is opened. But directly Jesus passes into the wilderness, and John continues his mission of preparation. In the wilderness, Jesus, in hunger and thirst, wrestles with the powers of darkness, and at the end of the forty days, returns to the banks of the Jordan, emaciated, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, drawing from the wondering prophet who had baptized Him, those fervid and profoundly comprehensive words, which have been a well-spring of consolation to the world,—"Ecce, Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi."

He gathers from day to day a small band of disciples around Him, and by His words of truth, and His works of love, the old religious life of the Jewish world is disturbed, and under distortion and prejudice rapidly organizes itself against the blaspheming innovator, as He is claimed to be. In every way the Jews who are in power strive to bring their ecclesiastical law against Him, and thwarted in so many instances, they become more and more exasperated, and determine to implicate Him in acts of opposition to the Roman authority, and charge Him with being a rebel and an insurrectionist. At last He is brought before the tribunal which represented the authority of imperial Rome, and is judged and condemned, and nailed to the cross, and buried, and the grave is closed and sealed with the signet of Rome, as though now and forever this pretending King is shut up in the rocky sepulchre.

This distant provincial trial, ending only in the death of a carpenter's son, or at most in the death of an eastern fanatic and pretender, although nature gave funereal signs of woe, hardly disturbed at all the ordinary hum of life throughout the Roman capital. The slight conflict of a provincial court wherein Jesus was judged could be but of small account to Roman legislators, although in fact it opened up a struggle and warfare which at last brought Rome, in her highest imperial representative, in humble penitence at the foot of the cross, to be baptized in the name of the crucified Nazarene.

Rome here, however, had conquered. Her soldier's lance reached into the very heart of Jesus, and some of the troops, who had borne the Roman eagle in triumph, cast lots for His garment, and slept by His sealed sepulchre.

The angels of God broke the seal, and rolled away the stone and sat thereon; and Jesus came forth the first born from among the dead. He regathered his scattered disciples, breathed upon them the breath of the eternal Spirit, and commissioned the eleven, (for one had betrayed him,) to go forth into *all the world*, and make disciples, baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. These disciples were in the main what the world calls illiterate, some of them timid, all of them like sheep among ravening wolves, and yet they are commissioned by a power reaching over heaven and earth.

Rome herself is now challenged, not with a warfare against Cæsar, but against Jupiter. "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, but unto God the things which are God's." Let Rome have her governmental polity, but not her religion, for Lo, I am with you even to the end of the world. Put the sword in its scabbard, and strike no blow against the imperial throne; but proclaim that at the name of Jesus every knee must bow, and every tongue confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Rome and Christianity are thus in reality brought face to face in mortal combat, for the deepest element of all national life is religion; and the overthrow of this in its national form, and as sanctioned by ages, must end in a revolution of social and political life more profoundly universal and significant than can be produced in any other way.

Let us now recapitulate the situation, as thus far brought to view. We have called attention to the vast proportions of the Roman power,—her empire stretching from the Atlantic in the west to the Euphrates in the east, and from the mouth of the Rhine in the north, along the banks of the Danube southward to the cataracts of the Nile and the burning sands of the Lybian desert; its teeming population, embracing over a hundred millions; its famous capitals scattered over this vast domain, where Roman officials and legions governed in the interests of the Eternal City; its magnificent standing army, numbering, probably, some six hundred thousand; its refined civilization, its literature and art, its grand body of jurisprudence; in fine, its complete mastery of the historical world, as the greatest concentration of its pride, and pomp and glory.

The renunciation of all this no Roman at that time for a moment dreamed of. The exchange of the imperial diadem for the cross would have been viewed as the most absurd paradox possible, requiring such a social and political revolution as never yet had been witnessed in history. Rome sat secure on her seven hills, proud mistress of the world, and claimed that her prosperity and power would continue as long as the waters of the Tiber should flow into the sea. Whatever elements of decay there might have been in the Roman state, they were yet invisible. To all appearance, although her age of conquests had gone, her strength was massive and concentred, and her authority respected far and near.

In bold contrast with all this sublimity of earthly power and glory of world dominion, we have directed attention to Bethlehem and Nazareth, to the Virgin Mother, and her Child cradled in the manger:—to the strange claim that in such poverty and lowliness and toil, God was in human flesh and dwelling among men, and to the fact that while earth was silent and dark, the stars of heaven sent their brightest to guide the sages of the East to adore Him, and that the ecstatic angels poured forth their choral strains.

"Such music (as 'tis said)
Before was never made
But when of old the Sons of morning sung."

We mentioned the attitude of the Roman provincial power to this strange mystery among the Jews; how Jesus was brought before Rome's tribunal; how Roman soldiers nailed Him to the cross, and pierced Him with the lance, and cast lots upon his garment; how under Rome's authority he was buried, and the seal of her power closed his sepulchre; how goaded on by the exasperated Jews and excited by a false spirit, the Roman provincial government did all this, and thus openly proclaimed the right and ability to cope with this new and despised power and overthrow it at will.

Nothing, indeed, to the natural mind, could seem more natural or more probable than that this would be done, and that the grave would forever close this strange Eastern fanaticism which had already aroused such hatred from the Jewish Sanhedrim.

The conflict, if the brief trial and its tragic issue may be called such, seemed to have ended, and the whole movement to have ceased with it, to give place to the ordinary routine of Roman life and politics. A small band of mourners—the weeping women and the desolate and scattered disciples—was all that remained of the tragic drama now ended.

But rapidly the whole scene changes. Rome's jurisdiction is invaded from on high. The Angel pays no heed to the watching guard or to the imperial seal, but rolls away the stone, and the apparently imprisoned captive comes forth, radiant with a victory wrought not by arms, but by the power of an endless life, and in the presence of which the soldiers are thrown down in bewildering amazement.

"The sleeping Conqueror arose
And burst their feeble chain."

Rome herself is now challenged: and when the Risen One breathed upon His disciples, and commissioned them to go into all the world, saying, All power is given to me in heaven and in earth, the challenge was to be carried at once into effective activity, and with a sublime proclamation of dominion, such as no Cæsar had ever dared to arrogate to himself. Rome might claim dominion over barbaric Gaul and Britain and the distant Parthians, and send her conquering legions forth to battle; but no such edict ever came from imperial lips to Roman generals as this spoken to eleven feeble men, *All power is given to me in heaven and in earth; go ye therefore unto every nation, and Lo, I am with you to the end of the ages.*

It could not be otherwise but that the two powers should wrestle for supremacy. It could not be otherwise but that they should meet in hostile array; and if we have any apprehension of the two forces engaged, we know that the conflict will be fierce and decisive, and that on it will hang the destiny of all subsequent history. It is the crisis of the whole world. Cæsar or the risen Christ must yield. The pride and pomp and glory of Rome must be cast prostrate beneath the Cross of the Nazarene, or Christianity be overwhelmed and submerged beneath the vast world-power of the Roman Empire, and fail to perpetuate to subsequent ages its mission of life and glorification. Where can there be found a conflict of such central import for mankind. Where can there be a battlefield upon which so many destinies hang, and which mankind should traverse with such solemn interest, and catch with tearful rapture the slightest, lingering traces of the heroic martyrs, whose blood stained the whole pathway to glorious victory?

The first theatre of conflict between the Empire and Christianity was of course in Palestine, for here Christianity began its process of extension. The Roman authority, urged on by Jewish malice and religious prejudice, and not properly measuring at first the extent or intent of the new religious life, showed itself at the beginning partly opposing and partly protecting; for at heart there was no real sympathy between Rome and Judaism. Rome indeed was more tolerant and catholic in spirit than the Jewish Sanhedrim. It took some years for Rome to realize that she had an adversary that soon would leave the distant Jerusalam and Antioch, and penetrate the very household of Cæsar.

As soon as the disciples had aroused the hostility of the Jews by their organization of a church, and their continuous labor of preaching and administering the sacraments in Jerusalem, physical means were resorted to for stifling the rising power and to settle the unwonted fermentation. The Apostles were arrested and cast into prison. We have no evidence that this was done by the Roman authority directly. It is enough, however, that the Roman authority did not interfere, but acquiesced, allowing, in way of policy, the Jewish ecclesiastical law to accomplish a settlement if possible according to its own method and process. The arrest, however, proved of no avail. The angel burst the prison door, broke the fetters which bound the Apostles, and re-commissioned them to speak boldly and fearlessly before the world. Again they are summoned before the Jewish tribunal, beaten and dismissed, as though such humiliating punishment would be a sufficient lesson for the future. Yet the work goes on. The leaven is leavening the three measures of meal, and the mustard seed is growing toward the spreading tree. Disciples are gained in larger numbers; and the citadel of Jewish religious life is at once assaulted with unmistakable energy, and threatened with overthrow, as an overgrown mass of corruption hiding the great truth which it should have supported and cherished. Stephen hurls his bold invective into the very face of the High Priest and Council, charging them with betraying and murdering Christ, and calling them a stiff-necked and rebellious people; and while the stones were showered on his head, the holy martyr fell asleep, seeing the opened heavens and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God.

> "Videns Dei gloriam
> Crescit ad Victoriam
> Suspirat ad praemia."

As yet the Roman authority is silent. The ferment is of too small proportions to call in the strong arm of Roman law. The tidal wave has not yet passed from the distant province to the Tiber, and does not threaten any serious danger there.

The Christians are driven from Jerusalem, and scattered abroad, but only to spread more widely their peculiar faith and life. Samaria is entered, the Ethiopian even is baptized, and the new faith already is mysteriously reaching out to Egypt, and drawing westward towards the world's capital. A free born Roman citizen, of fine attainments, and wondrous strength of character, who superintended the stoning of Stephen, and breathed out slaughter against the new sect, is overwhelmed by the glory of Christ near Damascus, and becomes a heroic Apostle. And not long after, a noble centurion of Italian troops is baptized by Peter, and thus the Gentile world is invaded; and now at last the Roman authority is awakened to some sense of the surrounding movement, and in the province raises its strong arm to strike an effective blow, and thus silence the whole agitation. Herod the King kills James with the sword and imprisons Peter with chains. But the angel releases him, and the soldiers are astonished, and the King, perplexed and bewildered, punishes the guards with death, and hurries down to Cesarea to free himself from the agitation which he finds himself unable to check; and there, eaten by worms, the miserable man dies, and the new faith grows and multiplies. Cyprus, the island of Venus, is penetrated, and the Roman deputy there, Sergius Paulus, is baptized, and brought beneath the cross. Churches are rapidly organized along the coast of Asia Minor, and Europe is entered, until at last at Philippi the Roman magistrates commanded the Apostles to be beaten and imprisoned; but again at midnight, while the captives sang, the gates of the prison were thrown open, the chains of the prisoners loosed, and the terrified jailer comes trembling, and falls down before the Apostles, and he and his household are baptized. Athens and Corinth are visited, and the mysterious power of Christianity is steadily and rapidly converging toward the Eternal City. Nothing seems able to stifle it; and Rome, whose eagles had swept over the historical world, whose legions had proved themselves invincible on a thousand fields of battle, whose civil and military and religious power had been acknowledged for ages as supreme, must now meet this new power and crush it, or find the very foundations of her heathen empire crumbling before her sight.

We cannot here enter into detail. It is enough to say that Paul is beheaded, Peter crucified, and John, the last of the heroic band, is banished to lonely Patmos. Rome has done her work promptly. Her strong arm has dashed down the great Apostles of the faith, and a noble army of martyrs already lies bleeding beneath the heel of her terrible despotism:

"Blood in slaughter, poured like water,
Torments long, and heavy chain,
Flame and axe, and laceration
They endured and *conquered pain*."

Such is but a faint picture of the first conflict of the Apostolic age with Rome.

But while Rome vainly supposed that she had thus strangled the infant Church, here and there throughout her vast empire, by the charred relics of some poor Christian, or by the scattered bones crushed by the wild beasts in the amphitheatre and now gathered within some secret vault, or by some blood-stained sod where the martyr fell, bands of disciples would gather and celebrate the martyr's birthday, as they rightly called it, and raise their chant so beautifully perpetuated in substance and spirit by the old hymn

"O beata beatorum
Martyrum solemnia."

Persecution had but enkindled their fervor. Martyrdom had but aroused the energies of their faith, and although the world's saeculum looked dark, and full of ominous forebodings to the Christians when the last of the Apostles fell asleep, yet they had repeated at the altar, "He shall come again to judge the quick and dead;" and therefore they turned their tearful eyes heavenward, waiting for the glory to break in at His coming as a proper response to their martyr cries.

There is a heroism of suffering more sublime than that of arms, a tragic grandeur in the cross, before which mere outward force becomes weak and mean. There is a power in agonizing endurance freely made for sacred principles and truth, more admirable than the pride and pomp and circumstance of glorious war. Such suffering, such agonizing endurance, were the weapons with which Apostolic Christianity met the colossal physical power of Rome, met it nobly and universally, not shrinking from the terrible ordeal, whether in the distant province, or within the splendid capital itself, whether among wild beasts in the amphitheatre, or at the burning stake.

At times the heavens opened, and to spiritual sight was revealed the might of the supernatural. The forces of darkness were beaten back by angels of light and deliverance. As we have said, prison doors were burst asunder, fettering chains were unloosed, and jailers brought trembling to their knees: yet this was but of transient significance, and in no sense constituted the elements of strength or the grounds of victory. Not from without to fleshly sight, but from within to faith, the perennial spring welled up its refreshing, invigorating waters to cool and soothe the heated and fevered agony of the valiant sufferer.

"In the dark we cry like children;
  And no answer from on high
Breaks the crystal sphere of silence,
  And no white wings downward fly:
But the heavenly help we pray for
  Comes to faith and not to sight,
And our prayers themselves drive backward
  All the spirits of the night."

We should do injustice to history were we to say that all the Roman Emperors or citizens were alike bitter and merciless to the early Christians. We speak of the general animus of the Roman

State, the spirit of the Roman nationality as directed against the new religious element which was so rapidly interfusing itself among the lower classes of the Empire, and at times winning to its favor the more influential and cultivated.

The Roman State claimed full jurisdiction over religion. It regulated the cultus pertaining to the gods, and demanded compliance with the "Ceremoniæ Romanæ," which of course the Christians could not admit: and these latter were regarded, therefore, as introducing a new system not acknowledged by the laws and customs of the Empire. . The Romans, as conquerors, plundered the palladia of the nations. Their god was Jupiter Capitolinus. The conflict was necessary, therefore, whatever might be the varying forms which it should assume. Not every Emperor was like the miserable Nero. Domitian was more considerate, and Nerva even stopped the malicious proceedings against the Christians which had marked the preceding reigns. But the current of Roman life remained the same. The hostility was a necessary characteristic of the Roman State in its heathen form; and however much at times the conflict might lull, the issue had to come, and either the whole Roman policy give way and the whole social structure be reconstructed, or Christianity yield its distinctive and absolute character, and become one of the tolerated religions of the State, and Christ be made an additional subordinate Roman god, as Tertullian, without sufficient authority however, says the Emperor Tiberius proposed at the start to the Roman Senate.

We may say that in the second century the necessity of the conflict in this form was pretty clearly recognized. It was felt on every hand that there could be no compromise. The old Roman saw that the very spirit of the Roman State could not recognize the claim of Christianity, and the Church saw that she could not yield to the spirit of Rome. The two stood face to face, in irreconcilable conflict, and the issue as yet is undecided.

By looking beyond the merely visible into the mysterious background of spiritual powers, it was in reality the Serpent and the Seed of the Woman in mortal combat. Under the Prince of this world Rome was hurling itself against the bucklers of Jehovah.

> "Highly they raged
> Against the highest, and fierce with grasped arms,
> Clashed on their sounding shields the din of war,
> Hurling defiance toward the vault of Heaven."

When the Apostles had fallen asleep, the important centres where churches had been organized were governed by those specially selected for this end by the Apostles themselves. These became the representatives of the Church, and drew upon themselves peculiarly the hostility of the Roman authority. Polycarp, of Smyrna, the disciple of St. John, was burned at the stake. Ignatius, of Antioch, was thrown to the wild beasts at Rome, and throughout the vast empire the effort was to extinguish Christianity by crushing its most distinguished representatives. It was almost certain death to be Bishop of Rome, and yet with strange pertinacity this seat would not remain vacant, but added martyr after martyr to the noble army which had gone before to their crown. Those less influential, however, did not escape, and north and south, east and west, on every hand, against men and women, boys and girls, servants and masters, the fires of persecution raged.

But we shall fail to understand the continuance of the conflict as it reaches out toward final victory, if we confine our attention simply to the earnestness and activity of individual Christians in the midst of the opposition of the Roman State. We must recognize the broad and general life of Christianity in the bosom of which the Christian stood, which was able not only to apprehend the individual disciple, but which could, as in itself of world-historical significance, meet the whole order of Roman civilization, and take up into itself the elements of its strength, and conserve them for higher ends. Rome's age of conquest, as we have said, was gone. The Parthians on the East demanded too much time and too great resources to make further wars there of any profit. The barbarians on the North, like the restless surges of the sea, dashed against the frontiers, beaten back often, but never really vanquished or overcome. Nothing could be gained there but empty glory at terrible cost. The Empire was turned in on itself, for the Republic had already, and of necessity, merged into imperialism; and rapidly inward dissensions manifested themselves, and disintegration began.

Rome had like a fate crushed down the gods, trampled out all genial life in its harsh service, and enervated all spirit with its merely abstract sovereignty of law; and this had already awakened deep yearnings after something more satisfactory—something that might reach the inner soul, the profound spirituality of our nature. Directly addressing itself to such yearnings, Christianity revealed the reality of a free, joyous suffering for high spiritual interests, accompanied with a patience which found its strength in the depths of a peaceful spirit; and this general characteristic became a silent power of incalculable account, drawing many from heathenism as by an instinctive impulse within their own souls. The dignity of human life as worthy of so great salvation, the eternal significance of man's person, as in the image of God, quite irrespective of all accidental earthly relations and conditions, and above all the full response to the very idea underlying all religion, viz: the union of the finite and the infinite—all this realized as never before and once for all in the mystery of the Incarnation, the Virgin-born God,—wrought as the energizing presence of a new creative life, addressing itself to every weary and troubled spirit, and drew to itself the highest moral susceptibilities of the Roman world. Christianity, by its association with suffering, by its removal from courts and its blessed residence with the poor and the down-trodden, by its home-like absence from the artificial, and its sympathizing grasp of domestic life and the everyday world around, dignifying and transfiguring these with a glory hitherto unthought of, made itself only the more deeply felt, and perpetuated in this regard the characteristics of its Master, at once so *human and divine.* This spiritual reality could not be burned at the stake, or crushed by wild beasts in the amphitheatre, or buried in the Catacombs. It was like an ever-present breath of love—a heavenly voice of sympathy heard above all earthly din, coming down from the serene heaven, and telling of a union and communion broader and more real and intimate than all nationalities—a fellowship where there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free, but all are one in Christ Jesus. The mystery of the communion of saints, in this view, confronted men who were unconsciously longing for something of the kind, and this was the pearl for which, when found, they readily sold all that they had. The beautiful romance called Fabiola brings this very prominently into view, and shows how correctly the author apprehended the essential characteristics of the age which he so graphically pictures. It was the age of a sublime tragedy, in which love and victory embalmed all sorrow and death; a tragedy which, like that of the Cross, commingled itself with the prophetic light and glory of the coming Easter; a Good Friday, preceded by the fragrant spikenard of Bethany, and the "Rabboni! it is the Lord," of the Easter morning dawn. It was the heroic age of faith, and has been on this account the fountain whence have issued streams of refreshing waters for all subsequent ages; and, like every heroic age, it has become the source of all that Christian art-inspiration which has been the admiration of mankind.

Thus far we have spoken of the *political* opposition to Christianity upon the part of the Roman State, which the Church met by patient endurance and martyrdom. We have remarked, however, that the *entire* animus of Roman life was hostile. We may expect, therefore, a kindred opposition to early Christianity in the sphere of literature. Heathen thought and philosophy will array itself against the new life which confronts it.

At the outset Christianity excited but little attention in this respect. The simple Evangelies, and the Epistles of the various Apostles, poorly contrasted with the literary style and polish of the Greek and Roman world. Indeed they made no claim in this regard. Their content was itself of such sublime significance, and involved such practical earnestness of aim, as not to allow of any secondary purpose, such as that of pleasing the cultivated literary taste of the educated Greek and Roman. Fishermen, whose chief school was their boats and nets on the sea of Galilee until called to be fishers of men, could not be expected to enter upon any literary rivalry with the Gentile world.

We find at first, therefore, from the educated Roman, who neglected the content and despised the form, only the opposition of contemptuous silence. Christianity is not worth noticing, and can be passed by as the mere ebullition of a religious sentiment, novel and transient, which will have its short day and then pass away. But it would not pass away; and contemptuous silence is forced into utterance and open opposition. "When we reflect for a moment upon the solemn beauty of Christ's deeds; when we realize the Sabbath glory which rests on Canaan, where they were performed; when we recognize the stream of eternal peace welling forth from His most arduous conflict in Gethsemane; when in fine

His whole life rises up before us as a sublime Messiad, which no poetry can surpass," we know that the literary world will in the end feel itself challenged, not by the form of the narrative it may be, but by the sublime world-drama which that narrative enshrines.

Soon the poetry and philosophy of the Roman world threw itself against the Gospel. Lucian ridicules it with biting satire. The fervid heroism of the martyr is to him but the enthusiasm of ignorance and pride. From his standpoint it could hardly be seen otherwise. Should men now, when no great interests are imperilled, when no great impulse of history agitates mankind, throw themselves into danger, and fearlessly court death, it would be but silly recklessness—an effort of bravado—a prideful bid for notoriety; but how different the whole appears to be and is, when in the birth-throes of history, in those great crises where ages are jostling each other, representative men stand forth and sacrifice all that they have and are, and open up through their own tragic overthrow a pathway for the world's advance. This Lucian either could not or would not see, and stands aloof, sneering and caricaturing what he did not comprehend. Celsus and Porphyry with more earnestness, and with an awakened sense of the danger in which heathenism stood, entered the arena. Early Christianity promptly met the charge, and gave to the world a body of Apologetic literature, no less sublime in its sphere than her noble army of martyrs in another. This literature reveals a new moral world, such as the heathen never had reached unto. It rises above the vanities and prejudices of worldly life, and has a serenity of purpose, a cleanliness of diction, a prudence and caution of judgment, and a loving human sympathy, which are sought for in vain elsewhere in that age. We venture the statement that no writings of any period have surpassed the power, and purity, and charm of Cyprian's letters. Neither is it a difficult task to discover the reason of all this. Faith has reached in upon the understanding, and truth found and realized flows forth in words prompted by a will hallowed by holiness. The Apologists hardly recognize a contest. They seem so calm, so fortified in the truth, so above all rivalry of words, as to strive only to win the adversary, not to conquer him. The martyr patience in them has found lodgment in their writings. They find within themselves a conviction of truth so full that no words can utter it; and they defend themselves by a prayer that those who oppose them may find the same fountain of truth and peace in Christ.

Contrast with any literary production of Rome, the letter of Cyprian to Donatus, and you will at once recognize a new moral world, a new purity of thought, a strength of apprehension covering the whole social world, which shows at once that that great Martyr had really and fully conquered the age which so mercilessly sought his blood. Indeed, the *manifest* victory which meets us in the time of Constantine the Great, was already gained by the martyrs and Apologists that preceded. Patience, suffering and purity of life, in word and act, reached and made possible in the living Lord, overthrew the power and pride of Rome, and conquered, long before the bloody victory of Milvian Bridge, and long before the fruits of the victory could show themselves. We cannot better conclude than by quoting a paragraph from the letter of Cyprian just referred to, which will suffer very much, so far as form is concerned, by our translation:

"The only tranquility which is placid and reliable, the only security which is solid, and firm, and lasting, is gained by him who, freed from the tempests of this unquiet world, and firmly anchored in the haven of salvation, can lift his eyes from earth to heaven, and, admitted to the favor of the Lord, and already most near to God in his mind, can rejoice to find that what among others seems sublime and great in human affairs, falls below what is lodged within his own spirit. He who is greater than the world can neither seek nor desire aught from it. How firm, how unshaken is that safeguard, how celestial that guardianship, with its perennial blessings, to have the bonds of this entangling world unloosed, and to come cleansed from this earthly defilement into the light of eternal immortality, while we recognize the insidious mischief which the enemy has hitherto plotted against us! We are driven to love the more what we are to be, by thus coming to know and condemn what we were. There is no need of wealth and solicitation and service, to gain with elaborate toil the highest dignity and power of man. It is a gift from God, freely and easily made ours. As the sun spontaneously sends out his rays, as the day brightens, as the stream irrigates, as the shower drops down the rain, so does the Celestial Spirit pour himself upon us. When once the soul has known its Author, gazing into the heavens, then higher than the sun, and lifted above all this earthly pomp, it begins to be that which it believes itself to be. You then, whom a celestial warfare has sealed in a spiritual camp, see to it only that you hold, in purity and sobriety, by religious practices, your discipline. Be ever engaged in prayer or reading. Now speak with God, and now let God speak with thee. Let Him instruct thee with His statutes; let Him direct thee. Whom He hath made rich, no one can make poor. No poverty can now reach him whose breast has feasted upon heavenly banquets. Ceilings decorated with gold and mansions clothed with encrusting slabs of precious marble will now seem sordid, when you know that it is yourself rather who is to be perfected and adorned, that this is your better home where the Lord sits as in His temple, and in which the Holy Spirit has taken His abode. Let us paint this home with the colors of innocence, and illumine it with the light of righteousness. It will never crumble with the decay of age, nor lose the freshness of its colors, or the lustre of its gold. All gilded counterfeits soon pass away, nor do those things which are not possessed in substance give any warrant of continuance to the possessor. This remains in clothing ever fresh, in honor unimpaired, in splendor perpetual. It can neither be abolished nor destroyed, but only fashioned into what is better, when the body returns to dust."

This rising above the world through faith, this clear recognition of the continuous inflow of life and light from the Spirit of the risen Christ, this grasp of the eternal in time, this inner vision of the surrounding spiritual guiding and encouraging and guarding, which Cyprian so beautifully expresses, and which his noble martyrdom sealed, this was the victory and ever will be the victory of Christianity. The fight and defeat of confessions, the wrangle of dogmaticians, and the eager fray of theologians, amount to very little unless at last they come back to this vision of faith, and strive each and all to drink in the descending dew and the irradiating light which reach the spirit from the ever-living *Word of God*, still abiding among men.

E. E. H.

Art. II.—CHURCH AND STATE IN GERMANY.*

NATHAN C. SCHAEFFER.

The readjustment of the relation between Church and State is a question which has for several years been agitating all classes of society from one end of Germany to the other. The civil authorities claim that the newly-created Empire has been put in jeopardy by the encroachments of Ultramontanism; the Roman Catholic Church affirms that the State is trying to suppress Christianity; and the Protestant Church feels every day more and more keenly that the hitherto existing forms of ecclesiastical government no longer meet the demands of the age. Hence the energy and the bitterness with which the conflict is carried on on both sides; hence too the measures recently instituted in the hope of inaugurating a new era in the history of German Protestantism. To exhibit the genesis and historic development of the principles which animate the parties arrayed against each other in this conflict, to show wherein the forms of Church government, which came down from

---

*Some years ago Dr. Nevin, in his "Answer to Prof. Dorner," pointed out how difficult it is for the theologians of Germany to form an adequate conception of American Christianity and Church life on account of the geographical distance and the political difference between the two countries. This was freely and candidly acknowledged by different parties on their return from the Evangelical Alliance. But the same thing is true also of Americans, when they try to form an opinion of the existing relation between Church and State in the Old World. We are apt to think that the present difficulties might be settled at a single stroke by simply disestablishing the State Churches; but on this point many of the Germans, who are well acquainted with the wants and internal affairs of the Church, and whose views of ecclesiastical government are anything but Erastian, hold altogether different opinions. In view of these circumstances, I have only after considerable hesitation prevailed upon myself to comply with the request of one of the editors of this Review, that I should prepare an article on the existing relation between Church and State in Germany. If I fail to give a true picture of affairs, it will not be from a lack of industry or of a heartfelt desire to do justice to all parties. As the book-market has of late been flooded with pamphlets and publications of various sorts bearing on this subject, I have thought it best not to attempt a complete summary of "the literature," but simply to give in foot-notes, as I go along, the *main* sources from which my information has been drawn.

the Reformation with comparatively little change, have become untenable, and to detail and discuss the steps which have been taken towards solving the existing difficulties, will form the aim and scope of the present article.

I.

Every student of history is more or less familiar with the long and bloody conflict between the Church and the State, which broke out in the eighth decade of the 11th century, giving rise among other things to the disgraceful scenes at Canossa, and finally causing the extinction of the Hohenstaufen dynasty. At first sight the whole conflict seems to turn on a mere formality. The emperors had hitherto claimed and exercised the right of investing the newly chosen bishops with office by bestowing upon them the customary ring and staff; Gregory VII. undertook to dispute this right. The real question at issue was, however, of far greater importance, for ring and staff are the ensigns of Episcopal authority, and when Gregory VII. protested against this form of investiture, he really claimed that the civil authorities have no right to interfere in the affairs of the Church. He did so on practical as well as on theoretical grounds. No one can deny that there were some things in the condition of the Church at that time to justify him in assuming such a position. Oftentimes persons not at all qualified for the office became bishop, through money or favoritism; these bishops again drew large revenues from the many priests, who had children; and the priests, as a matter of course, were compelled to be quite lax in dealing with the sins of the laity. To rid the Church of this simony and its attending evils, Gregory deemed it necessary to sunder her in every possible manner from the influences of the State. He pursued this policy with his whole heart, because it accorded with his theory of the relation between the civil and the ecclesiastical power. He regarded the Church as founded upon the See of St. Peter, the Pope as the Vicar of Christ, and the hierarchy as the highest embodiment of power and authority upon the earth. Hence he insisted not merely on the emancipation of the Church from civil power, so as to make the two coördinate, but he also maintained that the State should be the servant of the Church, that realms and kingdoms are but fiefs of Rome, and that the Pope therefore has the right to bestow crowns and to depose kings.

In the effort to carry out these views he was greatly assisted by circumstances. Henry IV. was still a boy when his father died, and in no long time after the sceptre had passed out of the father's powerful hands, the empire began to show signs of weakness, the inevitable result of internal dissensions. Besides, popular opinion was in favor of the Pope. For several centuries the people had been taught to pay more homage to the successor of St. Peter than to their civil rulers. Alcuin's famous letter to Charlemagne, in which he exalts the Pope above kings and emperors, the influence exerted by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which came to general notice in the 9th Century, and the resolutions passed by different synods, show what was the reigning opinion on this subject. Indeed, the hierarchy seldom missed an oportunity of enforcing its claims, either by words or by symbolical transactions. It is a fact specially interesting to the modern world, with its scientific knowledge of the earth's form, that in the year 1014 Benedict VIII. gave to Henry II. a golden apple, filled with ashes, surmounted by a cross, to signify that the earth, represented by the apple, is under the dominion of the Church, whose symbol is the cross.

It need not surprise us that this theory found favor in those days. It addressed the ideal side of man's nature, the side which had been developed by special training. The tendency of Christianity always has been, and ever will be, to make men lay more stress upon heavenly things than upon those of earth; to make them appreciate the value of ethical and spiritual entities; to inspire them with a love for that which is holy and pure and good. And in the earlier periods of the Middle Ages, when the secular power was mere brute force, when might was synonymous with right, when the weak were constantly in danger of losing their liberty and their rights, the Church stepped in and advocated the cause of the oppressed in the name of heaven; her clergy became the guardians of morality and exercised a spiritual surveillance over the conduct of men, extending from the cottage to the castle. Her courts, lauded even by Mr. Froude as "perhaps the greatest institutions ever yet devised by man," guided themselves in their decisions by the principles which form the basis of all justice and morality. Since the Church thus guarded the rights of the individual, and held out to him the hopes of a better life in a world to come, the Pope, as the visible Head of this Church, was invested with a halo of glory and of sanctity; and when he called upon the nations of Europe to rescue the holy sepulchre from profane rule, thousands sacrificed their fortunes and their lives to promote an object that was of no material value whatever! The crusades would never have been possible if the people of the Middle Ages had not been specially susceptible of being influenced by the *purely ideal.* It was this idealistic bent in the laity of that time which propped up Gregory's measures of clerical reform, and promoted his scheme of papal aggrandizement.*

Buoyed up by the waves of popular enthusiasm, it was natural for subsequent pontiffs to tread in the footsteps of Gregory. They carried out what he began, at least in so far as it was possible. Thus the third Lateran Synod, convened by Alexander III., forbade taxation of the churches and the clergy by the civil government without the consent of the bishops, and pronounced the sentence of excommunication upon every layman who should have the audacity to pronounce judgment upon a priest. The principles of action which guided Innocent III., are given in his registrum. He no longer vacillates in his opinion on the origin of civil power, as did Gregory, who sometimes spoke of kings as ordained of God and at other times affirmed that they had established themselves by violence, robbery and bloodshed. With Innocent the church alone is of divine origin, earthly kingdoms having been established *per extorsionem humanam.* The State and the Church are to each other like body and soul, the former being lifeless without the latter. Just as the moon depends upon the sun for its light, so do kings depend upon the Pope for their authority. When rival monarchs contend for a throne the Pope decides *principialiter et finaliter* who is to have the reins of government. If the secular powers determine anything in a manner injurious to the Church, he has the right to pronounce their action null and void. Innocent III. was successful in having a decree passed by the fourth Lateran Synod requiring every secular ruler, who wishes to be considered faithful, to bind himself by oath to drive all heretics from his dominions. Elated by his success in establishing the papal supremacy, not only in England but also in the Orient, this Pope exclaimed: "Dominus Petro non solum universam Ecclesiam sed totum reliquit seculum gubernandum." The position of the words at the beginning and the end of the sentence, as the reader will observe, emphasize the fact that it is the *Lord* who gave this power to Peter, and that as a helmsman governs a ship, which he directs whither he sees fit, so the Pope governs the Church and the whole world.

---

* "Nichts Anderes als dieser in der Menschheit durch das Christenthum so lebendig und allgemein geweckte Sinn für ideale Werthe, war der Zauber durch welcher das neue Rom die Gemüther für sein System der Beherrschung des Staates durch die Kirche gewonnen hat." Hundeshagen in Dove's Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht. Vol. 1., 1861, page 261.

Although the successors of Innocent found it impossible to wield the same powers, still they did not drop any of his principles. Boniface VIII. formulated them in the strongest possible language in the bull "Unam Sanctam," a document which has been much discussed during the past year. The words in St. Luke (xxii. 38): "And they said, Lord, behold here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough," are here interpreted to mean that the Lord placed two swords at the disposal of the Church, the one to be used *by* her and the other *for* her. The latter is wielded by kings and soldiers *at the nod and sufferance of the Pope* (*ad nutum et patientiam Sacerdotis*). The bull closes by making the belief in this relation between civil and ecclesiastical power a necessary condition of salvation.*

It would be useless for our present purpose to trace the tendency towards the centralization of power at Rome beyond the proclamation of this bull. The Pope evidently spoke ex cathedra, and since the Infallibility dogma has retrospective as well as prospective influence, the principles therein announced are of binding force for the whole Catholic world. That Rome still pursues the same policy and advocates the same principles as in days of yore, cannot be doubted by any one who has studied the events of the last twenty years. The Concordat with Ecuador and the propositions of the Syllabus, show how little the Curia is disposed to accommodate itself to modern ideas and modern civilization. Notwithstanding the attempt of the German bishops and other apologists to minimize the Vatican definitions into harmlessness, the statesmen of of Germany and the rest of the world can hardly bring themselves to believe that decisions to which Ultramontanes attribute a real authority and importance, do not mean something worth meaning. Listen for a moment to Perrone, the most distinguished among the living dogmaticians of the Catholic Church. In March, 1871, he wrote: "The Pope is the supreme judge of all civil laws. In him both the spiritual and the secular power converge into an apex, because he is the vicar of Christ, who is not only Eternal Priest, but also King of kings and Lord of lords."* Pius IX. has on several occasions acted on this principle. The allocution of June 22, 1868, declares certain Austrian laws (Paritäts-Gesetze) null and void, and the Encyclical addressed to the Prussian bishops on the 5th of last February makes a similar declaration with reference to the Falk laws, on the ground that they are contrary to the divine institution of the Church. In the Church itself there is an unmistakable tendency to make everything turn on the Pope as on a pivot. A few years before the Vatican Council the Archbishop of Paris resisted and successfully resisted the attempt of Pius IX. to exercise ordinary jurisdiction in the diocese of Paris; to-day such a thing is impossible. When Bishop Hefele, whose book on Honorius disproved the Infallibility dogma with mathematical certainty, held out for months against the acceptance of the same, he was taught by sharp practical experience his true position, since the renewal of his faculties was made dependent on his submission. The bishops in our day have no jurisdiction other than that derived from the Pope, and the priests again are entirely under the control of the bishops. The Pope thus is the central sun of the entire hierarchical system; and there seems to be no limit to the homage which he receives from certain quarters. In speaking of the reporter and editor of the speeches of Pius IX., Gladstone says: "Certainly, if the spirit of true adoration will make a good reporter, Don Pasquale ought to be the best in all the world. The speeches he gives to the world are a treasure, and that treasure is sublime, divine, inspired (I., 1, 2, 3). Not only do we quote these epithets textually, but they, and the like of them, are repeated everywhere, even to satiety, and perhaps something more than satiety. 'Receive then, as from the hands of angels, this Divine Volume of the Angelic Pio Nono' (p. 40), 'the most glorious and venerated of all the Popes' (p. 3), 'the most portentious father of all the nations' (p. 11). This is pretty well, but it is not all. He is 'the living Christ' (p. 9), he is the voice of God. There is but one step more to take, and it is taken. He is (in the face of the Italian government) Nature that protests, he is GOD THAT CONDEMNS." (p. 17).*

---

* Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni creaturæ declaravimus, dicimus, diffinimus et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis.

---

* Quoted by the "Kölnische Zeitung," February 27, 1875.

The foregoing will perhaps suffice to give the reader a glimpse into the nature of that tendency towards centralization, which has come down through the ages—a tendency which unceasingly strives to make all things subserve the purposes of an organization professing to be the only legitimate bearer of Christianity—a tendency which in our day has gone the length of placing not only bishops and priests at the mercy of a Pontiff declared infallible in matters of faith and morals, but also the laity themselves, their consciences being under the guidance and in the hands of a dependent clergy.†

---

* Quarterly Review, January, 1875.

† Cf. Hundeshagen's two articles in Dove's Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht, Vol. I. 1861, and the article "Staat und Kirche," in Vol. XXI. of Herzog's Real-Encycl. For the sake of justice, I will add Dr. Newman's explanation of the Pope's right to depose kings, as given in his letter to the Duke of Norfolk :

"Now let us observe how the Pope restrains the exercise of this right. He calls it his right—that is in the sense in which right in one party is correlative with duty in the other ; so that when the duty is not observed, the right can not be brought into exercise ; and this is precisely what he goes on to intimate, for he lays down the conditions of that exercise. First, it can only be exercised in rare and critical circumstances. Next, he refers to his being the supreme judge of Christianity, and to his decision as coming from a tribunal ; his prerogative, then, is not a mere arbitrary power, but must be exercised by a process of law and a formal examination of the case, and in the presence and hearing of the two parties interested in it. Also in this limitation is implied that the Pope's definitive sentence involves an appeal to the supreme standard of right and wrong, the moral law as its basis and rule, and must contain the definite reasons on which it decides in favor of the one party or the other. Thirdly, the exercise of this power is limited to the ages of faith ; ages which on the one hand incribed it among the provisions of the *jus publicum*, and on the other so fully recognized the benefits it conferred, as to be able to enforce it by the common consent of the peoples. These last words should be dwelt on ; it is no consent which is merely local, as of one country, of Ireland or Belgium, if that were probable ; but a united consent of various nations—of Europe, for instance—as a commonwealth of which the Pope was the head. Thirty years ago we heard much of the Pope being made the head of an Italian Confederation. No word came from England against such an arrangement. It was possible, because the members of

II.

It is well known what fate befell the Hohenstaufens in the conflict with Rome. The last scion of this noble family perished upon foreign soil in the year 1268; he died by the hand of the executioner upon the market place of Naples. Such is the fate of those whose ideas are in advance of the age in which they live; they fall a sacrifice to the cause which they espouse. But the cause itself, at least in so far as it is just, is sure to triumph at last. The idea which animated the Hohenstaufens did not perish with them. Their aim was to develop a national consciousness, to create an independent State, to establish a strong central government with the Emperor at its head; and this ideal of theirs was realized more and more as time rolled on. Before another half century had elapsed, Boniface VIII., who surpassed all his predecessors in the claims which he set up for the papacy, suffered the deepest humiliation at the hands of a French king, who identified his cause with that of the nation. The excessive enthusiasm for the Roman Pontiff had by this time died out: he could no longer induce the peoples to undertake fruitless crusades; they were too much occupied with home interests and their own national affairs. So strong did this national consciousness become, that at the great Councils which were held in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the voting was done according to nations, and in order to thwart the efforts at reformation, the Popes formed Concordats with the different States, thus accommodating themselves to the new order of things.

In Germany the tendency towards centralization, and the strengthening of the civil power, manifested itself in the effort on the part of the different rulers to make themselves independent sovereigns as much as possible. They sought to regulate civil and ecclesiastical matters according to their own notions of things. Oftentimes necessity obliged them to take this step; for Rome

---

it were all of one religion; and in like manner a European commonwealth would be reasonable, if Europe were of one religion. Lastly, the Pope declares, with indignation, that a Pope is not infallible in the exercise of this right. Such a notion is an invention of an enemy; he calls it malicious."

Perhaps Dr. Newman would find it difficult to show that all these conditions were complied with in those cases in which the Popes deposed kings and released their subjects from the oath of fidelity.

would not listen to their complaints, and generally thwarted them in their efforts to remove existing abuses. Thus one of the Saxon dukes declared himself "Pabst, Kayser und Teutscher Meister" in his own territories; the other reigning houses acted on the same principle. The Reformation itself contributed towards this end. However clear the Reformers were on points of doctrine, their ideas of ecclesiastical government were vague, and at times inconsistent with the fundamental principles which they advocated. They were a unit in denying the divine origin of that strong hierarchical fabric which culminates in the papacy; but their views of Church and State, as two coördinate factors having different aims and ends, should have led them to protest against degrading the Church into a servant of the State. Facts and circumstances are, however, stronger than theories; the hostile designs of their opponents obliged them to throw themselves into the arms of the State; the individual rulers became, to all intents and purposes, the bishops of the Churches in their dominions. They gradually confiscated all the property belonging to the cloisters and the congregations, promising at the same time to supply all the pecuniary wants of the Churches. They made laws compelling baptism within a specified time after birth, and regulating other things which should be left to the individual conscience. A change of rulers sometimes involved a change of confession for all the people living in a given territory. After it was too late, Luther and Melanchthon complained bitterly of the turn which affairs had taken; the former declared he would have been willing to see the episcopal office retained, but did not think it his business to assume a post which had not been assigned him.* The present age, as we shall see further on, suffers the sad consequences of the system that was then introduced.

The same struggle for independence over against Rome manifested itself also in the non-Protestant States, although somewhat more gradually, because during the religious wars of the 16th and 17th centuries the interests of the Catholic princes were closely bound up with those of the Papacy. Take, for example, Austria. In the year 1641 Ferdinand III. issued a very explicit injunction, forbidding the publication of all papal decrees without the consent of the emperor. He also prohibited the consistories from punishing the people by fines, and admonished the cloister of Vienna to desist from giving criminals the benefits of the right of asylum, at the same time threatening to adopt measures of greater severity in case the administration of justice were again hindered by their interposition. Maria Theresa ordered that white paper be pasted over those parts of the breviary which taught the right of the Pope to depose kings, and that in printing future editions these passages should be omitted altogether. If priests committed any offence, they were to be punished according to her penal code, and in the case of crimes deserving of death, to be handed over to the civil courts for punishment. She abolished the prisons which, before her time, were connected with the cloisters. Her son Joseph went still further. His aim was to bring all the reins of government, yea, every thread of power, into his own hands. Being a radical in theory, and having no respect for the historical products of the past, he did not hesitate to upset any institutions which were in conflict with his ideas of absolute sovereignty. In his opinion religion was only of use in so far as it trained the people to obedience; the Church was a police institution, which the State could legitimately employ for its purposes as long as the secular police find it impossible to do without her. It would take too much space here to specify his innovations in the realm of Church government, but their number and character may be inferred from the fact that his legislation bestowed attention upon the most private affairs, hesitating not even to make specifications in reference to the dress to be worn by girls.* The sovereign power had grown steadily since the peace of Westphalia. The Estates had lost their power; the nobility had sunk into insignificance; a large standing army and hosts of dependent officials were ready at a moment's notice to do the Emperor's bidding; and an absolute sovereign now exercised the same power over the Church, which Gregory and his successors professed to have over the kingdoms of this world.

---

*Luther closes his letter to Greser (1534) with the words: Distincta volumus officia ecclesiae et aulae aut deserere utrumque. Satan pergit Satan esse: Sub Papa miscuit ecclesiam politiae, sub nostro tempore vult miscere politiam ecclesiae.

Melanchthon to Camerarius: Ich sehe wohl was mir nachher für eine kirche haben werden, wenn die bischöfliche Regierung aufgelöst, ich sehe wohl dass die Tyrannei nachher viel unerträglicher sein wird als sie vorher war.

---

*Cf. Friedberg: Gränzen zwischen Staat und Kirche. Pages 156-165. "Die gesetzgeberische Aufmerksamkeit erstreckte sich bis zu den Miedern der Mädchen herab, 'da die schädliche Wirkung des Gebrauchs der Mieder auf de Gesundheit und besonders den Wuchs des weiblichen Geschlechts allgemein bekannt und die Nichttragung derselben hauptsächlich zu ihrer guten Konstitution und ehelichen Fruchtbarkeit unendlich viel beiträgt.'" Page 165, foot-note. This work gives the laws made by different countries to ward off the aggressions of Rome, from the Middle Ages down to 1872.

But lofty ideals never exerted much influence upon the rulers of the House of Hapsburg. They strove to strengthen and to increase their own hereditary domains; beyond that they pursued no fixed policy. Hence the old German Empire grew weaker and weaker, until its final dissolution took place in 1806. Then arose the system of small states, which made Germany the foot-ball of other nations. But her people still clung to the idea of a united fatherland. In times of the deepest humiliation, her poets sang of the return of Frederick II., and fathers repeated the legend to the sons sitting upon their knees. The sons, after they grew up, formed sasociations at the universities for the promotion of German Unity. From these associations went forth the man whose policy of blood and iron, coupled with far-sighted statesmanship, realized the dream-life and the hopes of six hundred years. Let us for a moment glance at the policy of the state, through whose instrumentality this consummation was brought about.

Upon one of the lofty peaks in the Swabian Alps, at no great distance from the ancestral home of the Hohenstaufens, overlooking a valley dotted with a thousand villages, stands a castle, which every Tübingen student visits. It bears the name of Hohenzollern. Its towers, piercing high up into the air, symbolize the aspirations of the dynasty which went forth from this place. From the rank of duke the family passed through the successive stages of elector and king, until in 1871 it attained the imperial dignity. From first to last it pursued the policy of maintaining a strong central government, yet in such a way as to promote the material prosperity of the people. Hence the patriotic devotion and the traditional loyalty of the Prussians. In the other States the people feel comparatively little attachment to their sovereigns; those of Prussia consider every word spoken against the king as an insult to themselves. No wonder that her young men make good soldiers; no wonder that her armies have so often decided the destinies of Europe. Backed up by the general good-will of their subjects, the Hohenzollerns have uniformly acted on the principle that the king is the source of all power in the State. In England the heads of the different departments are under the control of the Prime Minister; in Prussia they have always been directly responsible to the king. Frederick the Great was most of the time the only man in the realm who knew what was going on in all the different branches of government. He used to say: "My people and I understand each other perfectly; they can say what they please and I am allowed to do as I please." His nephew, Frederick William III., showed on several occasions how jealous he was of the prerogatives of the crown. Thus Schleiermacher was arraigned for having "allowed himself to criticise the views of the government." Some years later, several of the bishops acted contrary to the king's orders. He could scarcely contain himself as he listened to Von Altenstein's reports of the doings of the Archbishop of Posen. No sooner was the report finished than he exclaimed, in broken sentences which were peculiar to him: "Ruhe haben! Festnehmen!" (Arrest him! I want rest!) and the haughty prelate was imprisoned without trial or judicial sentence. When Frederick William IV. found himself obliged to give the people a constitutional government, he reserved unto the throne the right of creating at any time a majority in the Herrenhaus by simple nomination. Under the present King the representatives once refused to vote the appropriations necessary to increase and reform the army. The King and his Minister, Bismarck, carried out their plans in spite of the Parliament. The events of '66 and '70 showed the wisdom of their policy, and to-day they are idolized by a grateful nation. The late laws increasing the army to double its size, are but another step in the direction of centralization. The legislation itself emanates from above, the laws being first drafted in the executive departments, and then submitted to the imperial diet for amendment and ratification.*

---

* It has sometimes occasioned surprise that the German Diet should be able to do so much more work than the legislative bodies of other countries. But in Germany everybody is a "Fachmann," *i. e.*, everybody devotes his time and attention to some particular branch of science or business. The laws are generally framed by these Fachmänner, then discussed in the press, sometimes in ponderous tones, so that they are thoroughly sifted and pruned of imperfections by

It would be an easy matter to multiply examples, showing how the tendency towards centralization has been at work for centuries in the hereditary and acquired domains of the House of Hohenzollern. To this tendency is due the establishment of an Empire which in point of strength has never had its equal in the world's history. If to-day Chancellor Bismarck were to stamp his foot upon the ground, it would throw into existence an army of nearly three millions of well-disciplined soldiers. This centralizing tendency furnishes the key to the right understanding of the enactments which have been made to ward off the aggressions of Ultramontanism, and to break up the phalanxes which the Curia was gradually establishing in Germany.

III.

Cardinal Wiseman is credited with the prediction that the great battle between Protestantism and Catholicism would some day be fought out upon the Sands of Brandenburg. Probably his penetrating eye perceived the two opposite tendencies which were gradually developing themselves, and destined sooner or later to come into collision. The collision occurred as soon as they reached their culmination, the one in the proclamation of the infallibility dogma (1870), the other in the establishment of the Empire (1871). Up to that time it lay in the interest of each party to curry favor with the other. The Prussian kings needed the aid of the priests to win the hearts of their acquired subjects in Silesia and the Rhine provinces, and to suppress the seditious spirits of '48; Rome, on the other hand, needed the assistance of the State to carry on her work and to suppress the German Catholic movement, which began in '44. This unnatural working together of two antagonistic principles, gave rise to a very abnormal state of things. The favor and co-operation of the Catholic Church could, of course, only be secured by making concessions to her. Up to

---

the time they come before the Diet for discussion. After the doctors have decided, the others dare hardly venture to express an opinion for fear of exposing their ignorance. The main features of the Falk laws were mapped out by Prof. Friedberg at least a year before their adoption by the Prussian Parliament; and the enactments of the Diet against Ultramontanism appear likewise to be based on his suggestions. It may interest Americans to know that the late boundary difficulties between Great Britian and the United States, which had been referred to the German Emperor for arbitration, were settled according to the decisions of H. Kiepert, Professor of Geography at the University at Berlin.

1840, all correspondence between the bishops and the Pope passed through the hands of the officials at Berlin. The priests were compelled to perform the marriage ceremony, in cases where the requirements of common law had not been complied with. Frederick William IV. not only yielded to the wishes of Rome on these points, but he also adopted the principle that every religious society shall be independent in the management of its own affairs. This would have been well enough, had he also repealed the old laws of coercion in Church matters. But since this was not done, there grew up a series of wrongs and contradictions, such as an American citizen never dreams of. Catholic parents were obliged to have their children baptized, and therefore forced by the police to submit to the regulations which the canon law enjoins in this matter. The children were obliged to attend schools in the hands of a clergy over whom the State no longer exercised any control. Since the law did not allow civil marriage in the case of memmers of the established churches, it was necessary, when a Catholic wished to marry a person belonging to another confession, for both either to join a dissenting Church, or to promise to train up the children in the Catholic faith. There was no appeal to civil authorities in matters of church discipline, and yet the citizen lost some of his civil rights through the sentence of excommunication. The bishop could employ the civil power in summoning witnesses, and in punishing priests with fines or imprisonment. The State obliged its citizens to pay moneys for the support of the Church, without being able to inquire how those moneys were used. It would be an easy matter to specify more instances in which the State, instead of protecting the rights of the individual, exposed her Catholic subjects to the arbitrary regulations of Rome. Nor were there any guarantees against aggression upon her own safety. In fact, the State forced children into schools where the invalidity of her own laws was taught.* The

---

*"Der Staat zwingt die katholischen Kinder in Schulen, wo ihnen die Ungültigkeit des Staatsgesetzes gelehrt wird, er muss geschehen lassen dass die dem Gesetze Gehorsamen excommunicirt werden, dass sie, wie mir gesehen haben, die Kirchliche Ehe nicht schliessen können, zu welcher der Staat sie nöthigt, ja dass sie noch im Tode die Schande eines unkirchlichen Begräbnisses erfahren müssen auf dem Katholischen Kirchhofe des Staates."—Friedberg. page 434. This was written previous to the passage of the Falk laws and the Civil Marriage bill.

State supported theological faculties for the instruction of Catholic students, and yet a single word from the bishop was sufficient to drain, and in several instances did drain, all the hearers from the lecture rooms. A foreign sovereign laying claim to universal monarchy, supposed by many to have the keys of heaven in his hands, might issue missives enjoining disobedience to the laws of the land, and the civil authorities possessed no power to prevent the publication of these missives; and to crown all, the State for a period of twenty years connived at the efforts of the Curia to educate a clergy in every respect subservient to the interests of Rome, and at the rapid spread of a religious order, whose members are bound by the vow of unconditional obedience to the Pope.

This anomalous league between the throne and the altar could of course not continue for ever in a monarchy like Prussia. Probably the rupture would have occurred much earlier, had not Prince Bismarck had too many other enemies to contend with in the former part of his career. But after the enemies of German unity, who were at the same time the allies of Rome, had been subdued, and after the Curia found itself disappointed in the hope that Germany would restore the temporal power of the Pope, the conflict broke out. The agitation which thereupon spread over the land, the passage of the laws imposing penalities upon seditious pulpit harangues and placing the schools more directly under the control of the State, and the banishment of the Jesuits, whereby the Empire hurled away from itself the viper it had so long cherished in its bosom, were detailed in a previous number of this Review. We, therefore, pass on to the enactments of '73.

On April 5th, Arts. 15 and 18 of the Constitutional Charter of Prussia were changed so as to read:

Art. 15. The Evangelical and the Roman Catholic Church, as well as every other religious Society, regulates and administers its affairs independently, but *remains subject to the civil laws and the legally regulated supervision of the State.*

With the same restriction every religious Society remains in the possession and enjoyment of the institutions, legacies and funds destined for purposes of worship, instruction and beneficence.

Art. 18. The right of nomination, proposal, selection and confirmation in the appointment to ecclesiastical offices is abolished, in so far as it belongs to the State and does not depend upon patronage or special legal titles.

This regulation does not apply to the appointment of chaplains for the army and for public institutions.

In other respects the law regulates the competence of the State in matters pertaining to the preparatory education, the appointment and the dismissal of the clergy and religious servants, and fixes the limits of the disciplinary power of the churches.

The changes and additions are printed in italics.

In the following May, four enactments were passed, bearing date of 11, 12, 13, 14 of this month, having reference respectively (1) to the preparatory education and employment of the clergy, (2) to the Church's power of discipline and the establishment of a judicial court for ecclesiastical affairs, (3) to the limits of the right to use ecclesiastical means of punishment and correction, (4) to the manner in which members may separate themselves from the established churches, or from a religious society having corporate rights.

The first of these enactments applies only to the Protestant State churches, both in the older provinces and those acquired in 1866, and to the Roman Catholic and the Old Catholic Churches, because the State does not provide for the education and the payment of the clergy belonging to other religious societies. In reference to education, the requirements are that the candidate for orders shall pass the final examination at a gymnasium; that he shall study three years at a university in the German Empire, or at a seminary recognized by the State authorities as of equal rank; that at the close of his course of study he shall pass a public examination, showing that his general training is sufficient, especially in the departments of philosophy, history and German literature. The course of training in theology is left to be regulated by the Churches themselves.• The law also stipulates that no more boys shall be received into the seminaries giving the same instruction as a gymnasium. In reference to the employment of the clergy, the law specifies that persons can only be appointed or installed into ecclesiastical offices when they are citizens of the Empire, and when the State offers no objections on the ground that the candidate has not complied with the requirements of the law, or that he has committed a crime or transgression subjecting him to punishment, or that there are reasons for supposing that he would disobey the civil laws and disturb the public peace. The Cultus-Minister has the power to dispense natives from the three years theological study at a German University, if they have studied the same length of time in another department or at a foreign University. He can also dispense foreigners from the final examination at a gymnasium, from the three years course at a University, and from the public examination before the State authorities.

The second enactment applies to the same religious societies as the first. It specifies that acts of discipline can only be exercised by ecclesiastical bodies, residing in the Empire and composed of Germans, which of course obliges the Pope to exercise his disciplinary powers through the medium of the bishops and their subordinates. The employment of corporal punishment is not allowed, nor fines exceeding 30 thalers, or the income of one month when that is more than this sum; nor can any one be deprived of his freedom (i. e. imprisoned) against his will or for a period longer than three months, and only in "Demeriten-Anstalten," situated in the Empire. Every species of dismissal or suspension from office must be preceded by a regular trial, and the grounds of the decision stated in writing. The party upon whom the sentence falls can make an appeal to the Supreme Judicatory for ecclesiastical affairs provided for in this enactment. This Court has its seat at Berlin and consists of eleven members, six of whom including the President are taken from judges in office in other courts, and the remaining five are appointed for life. The specifications of this enactment have reference merely to church officials.

The third enactment prohibits every religious society from threatening with, ordaining or announcing any forms of discipline or punishment other than those which belong to the purely religious sphere, e. g. the excommunicatio major, which prohibits all intercourse between the faithful and the one who is thus punished. On the other hand the excommunicatio minor, the exclusion from the Lord's table and the like, are permitted. This statute also forbids corporal punishments, as well as those involving property, freedom or civilian honor (bürgerliche Ehre). No person is allowed to be disciplined for having performed an act enjoined by the civil laws, or for the purpose of deterring him from performing such an act, or for having exercised or refused to exercise, in favor of a particular party, his right to vote at a public election. Acts of discipline shall not be carried out in an insulting manner, or be made known by notices printed in newspapers or posted up in public places, although they may be announced to the congregation.

The fourth enactment specifies the manner in which persons who desire to sever their connection with a religious society having corporate rights, can secure exemption from the duties and payments which their membership involves. It also frees the Jews from some of the contributions which they were formerly required to make towards the support of Christian Churches.

On May 20th of the ensuing year, another enactment was passed-making specifications as to the manner of filling vacant Episcopal sees, forbidding official acts until the person chosen has taken the oath of fidelity and obedience to the government, and making provision for the appointment of a commissary to manage the secular affairs of the bishopric as long as the vacancy is not filled.

Each of these statutes prescribes the manner in which its regulations are to be carried out, and fixes punishments for those transgressing them, the maximum in the different cases varying from 100 to 1,000 thalers fine, and from 6 months to 2 years imprisonment. A law passed by the Diet, and bearing date May 4, 1874, also enables the authorities of any one of the States to banish an ecclesiastical officer from a given district, if after he has been deprived of office he undertakes acts showing that he still lays claim to the office. These laws, as the reader will have noticed, were all made in the month of May; hence in Germany they are always spoken of as the Maigesetzes, whereas in England they go by the name of Falk laws.*

Heretofore every minister, with the exception of those in several of the Rhine provinces, was to some extent a civil officer. For it was his business to register all births, marriages and deaths occuring in his parish, to proclaim the names of those intending to marry at least three times, and to make out certificates of citizenship in cases of removal—services for which he received specified fees. The law of March 9th, 1874, placed these registers into the hands of purely civil officers, thus striking another blow at clerical power. It requires every marriage to be consummated before the civil magistrate, and not until this has been done is a minister allowed to perform the ceremony according to the ritual of the Church. It is entirely at the option of the parties whether they will have the ceremony repeated by the minister, the civil act being all that is required to make the marriage valid in the eyes of the law. On the 25th of last January the same statute, slightly modified in details, became a law for the whole Empire.

---

*The preceding summary does not claim to be exhaustive, but simply aims to give the American reader a general idea of the nature and scope of these laws. Hinschius' work on this subject, containing introduction, text and commentary, is a volume of 212 pages.

In reference to these laws as well as the one requiring every able-bodied man, be he priest or not, to serve in the army, the Catholic Church could, with consistency, assume but one attitude, namely, that of opposition. According to her symbols marriage is a sacrament, which can only be consummated by a priest. Baptism is a rite which, when once performed, places her under obligation to train up the child in the only true faith. Some years ago, when a Jewish child received baptism through the mistaken zeal of a servant girl, the child was torn from its parents, and in spite of the protest of the English government against this unnatural proceeding, the papal government refused to restore the child, thus acting consistently with the principles of the Romish Church. A sincere Ultramontane can not help looking with abhorrence upon the law which places the schools under the control of the State. In his eyes all the above laws are so many ingredients of the anti-Christian system of adjusting the relations between Church and State. An English writer says: "This system (the anti-Christian system) has been introduced of late into more than one country in Europe and South America. The State denies to the Church her natural right, for instance, to hold property for the support of her institutions; it seizes that property and applies it to its own purposes. The State makes war on the practice of evangelical counsels in imitation of our Lord; it proscribes religious orders, and sets the brand of exile on their members. The State tears the priest from the sanctuary and forces him to bear arms in wars, just or unjust, as it lays hands on the student and educates him as a soldier, though God calls him to the altar. The State takes the child from the parent and from the pastor, and educates him in its own schools, in a mixed religion of its own; it enters once more into the seminary, prescribes what the future priest shall learn, what books he shall study, and makes itself the final judge as to his fitness to enter upon the sacred ministry, and then supervises his doctrine and his preaching, and takes into its own hands his relations to his bishop, or the conditions of his communications with the chief Pastor of the faithful."* The Encyclical of November 21, 1873, uses still stronger language. After recounting the innovations on the part of the Prussian government in the education, appointment and removal of the clergy and after referring to the hindrances laid in the way of the bishops, that they might no longer be able to maintain purity of doctrine in the schools and enforce obedience from their subordinates, this document goes on to say: "*Finally, that nothing should be wanting whereby the Catholic Church might be entirely suppressed,* a royal Judicatory for ecclesiastical affairs has been instituted, before which the bishops and keepers of the sanctuary (Hirten des Heiligthums) may be summoned to judgment as well by private individuals, who stand under them, as also by public magistrates, that they may be submitted to sentence like criminals, and be hemmed in the exercise of their spiritual office. Thus, then, notwithstanding the solemn pledges of ruling sovereigns, and the public stipulations which repeatedly guaranteed to her full and absolute religious freedom, *the holy Church of Christ now languishes in this land in deep sorrow, deprived of all her rights and exposed to hostile powers, which threaten her with total destruction; for the new laws aim at making her further existence impossible.*"

When similar laws were passed in France and in Baden, the Curia, acting on the principle that an evil may be tolerated for the sake of preventing other greater evils, adopted the policy of passive obedience; but the strong language of the Encyclical showed that a different policy had been adopted in the present case, namely, that of passive resistance. The sequel showed that the Curia had not miscounted its men. The bishops consigned their personal property to relatives or friends, then disobeyed the laws with a determi-

---

*[*Dublin Review*] for January, 1875, page 186.

nation to take the consequences. Since the fines could not be collected, their salaries were confiscated, and as these were not sufficient to cancel all the fines, the only way left was to imprison them. The lower clergy followed the example of their superiors. At the close of the year '74, the number of those fined or imprisoned amounted to 1,400, two archbishops and three bishops being among those who were obliged to taste the charms of solitary confinement. In addition to his other punishments the Archbishop of Posen was declared deposed from office. The new year brought with it a similar sentence upon the Bishop of Paderborn. Thus far, however, the desired effect has not been reached. The bishops and their clergy have remained faithful to the policy of the Curia; the punishments imposed upon them only serve to inflame the populace against the government. A papal delegate secretly manages affairs in Posen; the searches which have been made for documents, and the incarceration of several dozen priests who refuse to give testimony, have not brought out the slightest evidence against any one. The prison cell has been stripped of its terrors, because in the eyes of the faithful it has become a matter of honor to suffer in this way for the church. Vacant parishes are visited by priests in disguise, who administer the sacraments to the sick and the dying. When any one is to be buried, the cross is carried before the coffin; at the grave three pater-nosters are said by the people, who thus make intercession for the departed one, for all whose remains repose in the churchyard, and for the one in the procession who will next have to appear at the bar of eternal judgment; they then assemble in the church to offer up prayer for the repose of the one just buried. On the Sabbath the congregation celebrates lay services, the attend. ance being larger than usual. At the same time the bishops send out to their flocks words of comfort and assurance. One of the pastoral letters declares that when a person is deprived of the sacraments without being himself at fault, God's mercy will make it all right; that when no priest can be obtained, the sacrament of marriage may be consummated in the presence of two witnesses; that full penitence, coupled with a heartfelt desire to obtain the absolution, secures the forgiveness of all sins and reconciliation with God. Surely, if this lamentable conflict presents any aspects which may be called bright in comparison with others, the brightest is found in the providential dispensation which makes the prelates themselves assist in bringing the people to the consciousness that the salvation of the individual is not indissolubly bound up with hierarchical rites and ceremonies.

It was stated by many of the secular papers, although denied by the "Germania," that in December last the Pope, finding the Prussian government carrying out the ecclesiastical laws without let or hindrance, directed the bishops to devise some *modus vivendi* without actually recognizing the odious statutes. In their reply the bishops pointed out the inexpediency of the course suggested. No doubt they acted wisely. Before the Vatican Council they had assured their flocks that infallibility, being an innovation, could not be proclaimed by the sacred assembly; during the sessions they opposed the dogma by mouth and pen; on their return home they changed their opinion as it were over night, and became zealous persecutors of those who rejected the dogma. This sudden change produced a very unfavorable impression; a second change would have done so to a still greater extent. Not satisfied with dissuading his Holiness from taking the contemplated step, some of the more ardent amongst them, headed by the Archbishop of Mayence, demanded an authentic declaration on the part of the Pope, condemning the government in unqualified terms, and rejecting all thoughts of a compromise. Be this as it may, when the Encyclical of February 5th came, it startled no one more than the bishops themselves. "They had sown the wind and reaped the whirlwind." They had asked for a strong protest, and they received a bull, sounding like the highly spiced manifestoes by which medieval pontiffs claimed secular supremacy over all kings and States. A correspondent of the London *Times* states that the bishops, after a brief correspondence, agreed not to publish the dangerous missive, but that the unthinking impetuosity of some unknown underling sent a copy to the Westphalian *Mercury*, and thus enlightened the world on the subject. It came in an envelope which had been stamped in the post-office at Rome. Its authenticity has never been called in question. It refers to the many injuries done to the Church, lauds the heroic conduct of the two deposed prelates, pronounces the Falk laws invalid on the ground that they are contrary to the divine institution of the Church, calls those who obey inexcusable, and consigns the priests who accept office under these laws to eternal perdition. The government replied by introducing a bill to stop all payments out of the Royal State Treasury to the bishops and the clergy, until evidence of a willingness to obey the laws has been given by a formal declaration, or by unequivocal actions. It also seized those issues of the Ultramontane journals which published the text of the Encyclical with comments of approbation, and punished the editors for seditious conduct. The other journals published the document without let or hindrance; but since they do not circulate largely among Catholics, the adherents of the Pope were obliged to invent a new method of bringing it into the hands of the people. With characteristic shrewdness, they turned the law to their own advantage. A member of the Abgeordnetenhaus, a brother of the editor of the Westphalian *Mercury*, availing himself of the freedom which the law allows to men of his position, read the Encyclical, amid the jeers of the house, on the plea that he wished to make a speech against the bill introduced by the government, for which purpose he deemed it necessary to refer to the exact words of the text. Of course no one understood him, on account of the noise and confusion which ensued; but the stenographic report contained the Encyclical in full, so that it could thenceforth be circulated under the protection of the law, which permits the reprint of any part of the proceedings of the Landtag.

After this bill had been passed in the Abgeordnetenhaus by a very large majority, the bishops addressed a letter to the king, asking him to interpose his veto. In it they refer to the early martyrs, who suffered death rather than obey ordinances of the State which forbade the proclamation of divine truth, or required a denial of the Christian faith. They declare that they cannot comply with the requirements of the proposed law without violating their consciences and the principles of Christianity; that the withdrawal of their support for the purpose of obliging such compliance is therefore unjustifiable from a Christian standpoint. They say that during the secularization period the honor of Prussia was pledged to supply the wants of the Churches, and that bitter feelings will be excited in the hearts of Catholics if the government suspends its payments to their clergy at a time when the clergy of other denominations receive increased donations from the State. The letter closes with an eloquent appeal to His Majesty as the protector of the Christian Churches in Prussia—as the wearer of a crown to which Catholics have always shown true loyalty, especially in the midst of political storms.

The King requested the ministry to give an answer in his name. They did so in language clear, forcible and cutting. Their reply expresses regret and astonishment that ecclesiastics of such high rank as the bishops should make themselves the organs of a statement to the effect that it would be a denial of the faith to obey certain laws in Prussia, when these same laws have for centuries been obeyed, and are still willingly obeyed by the clergy of other countries, where they promise unconditionally to observe said laws by a sacred oath. No less remarkable and untrue is the assertion that the proclamation of divine truth is forbidden by the laws which the bishops have recently disobeyed, although only in Prussia. The bishops are furthermore told that a merely superficial examination would have been sufficient to convince them that the increased donations are intended for the benefit of the Catholic clergy, as well as for the clergy of other denominations. Nor would the State ever have made any grants or promises to the Catholic Church, if the bishops and the clergy had claimed the right of obeying or disobeying the civil laws as the Pope might direct. The document in conclusion reminds some of the bishops of their predictions previous to the proclamation of the Vatican decrees, and requests them to ask themselves whether, by a firm advocacy of their convictions, they might not have saved the fatherland from the strife and the disturbances which they then foresaw and warned against.

A simple glance at France is sufficient to bring out the full force of this reply. There the Pope can do nothing without the consent of the government. By a special law the decrees of an Ecumenical Council are null and void unless sanctioned by the State. No bull or brief is allowed to be published or carried into effect without the permission of the government. The government appoints the bishops; the Pope confirms them and gives them canonical investiture. The removal of a bishop, the appointment of ecclesiastics, the establishment of a cloister or a religious society, the acquisition of property on their part either by purchase or bequest, and the convocation of a deliberative assembly composed of the bishops or their clergy, are all conditioned by the consent and approval of the government. If a priest performs the marriage ceremony before the civil act has been attended to, he is punished by a fine, and in case the offence is repeated, by a term of imprisonment from 2 to 5 years. The law limits the binding force of monastic vows to one year in the case of persons between 16 and 20 years of age, and to five years in the case of persons of a more advanced age. The *appel comme d'abus* of the French code is far more comprehensive than the Falk laws, in the cases in which appeals may be made to the civil authorities.*

But Bismarck is never satisfied with mere words. To the astonishment of the Ultramontanes, a proposition was next introdnced into the Landtag to abolish the two articles of the Constitution given above and Article 16, according to which religious societies enjoy unhindered intercourse with their superiors, and the publication of ecclesiastical ordinances is subject only to the restrictions to which all other publications are subjected. This is to be followed by the introduction of another law, providing for the abolition of all cloisters. The Landtag is also engaged in the consideration of laws regulating the management of the secular affairs in the Catholic Churches and giving the laity a voice in the matter.

The votes thus far taken at the different readings of these bills have resulted in a majority of three to one in favor of the government. Many of the deputies do not like to see the constitution changed; but they deem it necessary to support the government, and to break the power of a hierarchy which arrogates unto itself the prerogative of annulling the laws of the land. Some of the liberals are beginning to feel that the weapons which they helped to forge may be brandished against themselves. The freedom of the press is taken advantage of by Ultramontane writers in combating the principles which the liberal party advocates. Some of the articles of the Constitution by which this party sought to limit the power of the throne are now an obstacle in their way, which must be removed before they can successfully carry out their plans against the Curia. Hence they do not hesitate to support the policy of the government.

---

* Schwäbische Mercur, April 22, '75. Friedberg's Gräuzen zwischem Staat Kirche, 475–528. Les cas d'abus sont: l'usurpation on l'excés de pouvoir, la contravention aux lois et réglements de la république, l'infraction des régles consacrées par les canons refus en France, l'attentat aux libertés, franchises et contumes de l'Eglise gallicane, et toute entreprise ou tout procédé qui dans l'exercice du culte, pent compromettre l'honneur des citoyens troubler arbitrairement leur conscience, dégénérer contre eux en oppression ou en injure ou en scandale public. Page 519.

The newly proposed laws may call forth eloquent speeches and give rise to animated discussions; but as to the final result no one has any doubts. In all probability they will receive their final ratification long before these pages appear in print; for the weight of Bismarck's name and the prestige of unparalleled success make his word law for both monarch and subjects. The great bulk of the nation supports him. When a new measure is proposed, everybody is anxious to hear what the Minister-President has to say, and most of the deputies shape their conduct accordingly. His speeches in the legislative halls have a clear, metallic ring about them, which makes them heard throughout the whole land. When his opponents say, "We must obey God rather than man," he reminds them that the question to be decided is: Shall we obey the Pope rather than the king? His utterance, Mit Gott für König und Vaterland, was reëchoed by thousands of loyal hearts all over the realm. On the other hand the adherents of the Pope are united, resolute, determined to resist unto the very last, no matter what may be the consequences. He praises them for their fidelity, and bestows honors upon the most violent opponents of the government. Ledschowski, the most refractory of the bishops, has been rewarded with the Cardinal's hat. The bishops in return laud the wisdom of the Pope's administration, and assure the people that Infallibility can never endanger the true interests of the fatherland. They move like one body, for their actions are shaped at Rome.

In former days many a bishop was obliged to act for himself, on account of the difficulty of inter-communication. Now-a-days the Pope sends orders and instructions, as well as blessings, by railroad and by telegraph. Thus the waves of this agitation strike higher and higher, and the storm has apparently not yet reached its height. We see here a collision of two antagonistic forces, a conflict between two opposite historical forces. The address of the bishops and the reply of the ministry indicate the theoretical attitude of the two parties; and since neither one has thus far developed all its resources, there is little prospect of a speedy reconciliation. The blunders committed on both sides show how difficult it is, while seeking to maintain one's own rights, not to transgress upon the rights of others. Some of the Liberals, indeed, wish Pius IX. long life, because they think his mistakes are helping their cause admirably. Still neither party can boast of much success. Very few priests have manifested a willingness to obey the laws. The people, however, do not hesitate to transact business with the commissaries whom the government has sent to manage the secular affairs of the vacant bishoprics; nor are there any signs of the reaction which Ultramontanes had hoped would cause the downfall of Bismarck. Moreover, it would be improper to ap prove or condemn these enactments on the ground of mere temporary success or temporary failure. They must be judged by an altogether different standard. Before passing on to this part of the subject, it is necessary to pay some attention to the other, more numerous branch of the Christian Church in Prussia.

IV.

The conflict between the papacy and the civil authorities at Berlin was, of course, not without its effect upon the Protestant Church. For since modern legislation professes to deal with all the different classes and members of society on strict principles of justice and equality, the laws above described could not be restricted to the Catholic Church alone, but they went into operation throughout the entire kingdom. No sooner had Church coercion ceased, than the number of baptisms and marriages before the clergy suffered a fearful diminution, in some districts the rate of decrease being more than 50 per cent. It aroused the clergy from their slumbers; they now saw to what extent the people had become estranged from the Church, and all over the land there went up a cry of dissatisfaction with the existing order of things. Some raised their voices against these laws, on the ground that they tended to unchristianize the State; others demanded a separation of Church and State, because in their opinion the government of the Church from the green tables of the Bureaucracy was no longer capable of meeting the demands of the age. With biting arcasm the press censured the clergy for not raising their voicess against the passage of the Falk laws, whereas they at once raised a hue and cry when a portion of their surplice fees fell away through the passage of the civil marriage laws. But a man can hardly be expected to keep quiet when a law is passed which threatens to take the daily bread out of his mouth. According to the calculations of the Evangelical "*Oberkirchenrath,*" these fees amount annually to 971,000 thalers. The same body declared that the falling away of these fees would have a fatal influence upon some of the parishes. What this meant can easily be seen by a reference to the provinces. In some parts of Silesia the perquisites constituted four-fifths of the pastor's salary. Of the 1,100 thalers which one minister received, only 300 were fixed income. Salaries of 500 or 600 would be reduced to 150 or 200. A speaker in the Herrenhaus declared that in one of the Berlin churches the pastor, organist and sexton were paid solely out of the surplice fees, and that if these fell away, the Church would have to be locked up as sure as 2 times 2 is 4.

With the small salaries which most of the clergy receive, it is impossible to lay up anything for the future. When the father dies his family receive an annual pension ranging in most cases from 150 to 200 thalers. But if he dies in the second or third year of his ministry, the pension is in the first case between 50 and 60, in the second case between 100 and 133 thalers. If we take into consideration that these salaries and pensions were fixed years ago, when the prices of living were much cheaper, and that through the influence of the late wars some prices have doubled and quadrupled themselves, the above figures indicate a degree of want, woe and misery, such as neither tongue can tell nor pen describe.*

---

*It may perhaps be allowable in this connection to add a quotation from Gerlach's pamphlet on the "Dotations ausprüche und der Nothstand der Evang. Kirche in Konigreich Preussen," from which I take most of my data on the present condition of the Church in Prussia. On page 43 he says: "Die Taxen für die Stolgebühren stammen durchweg aus früheren Jahrhunderten in denen das Geld einen anderen Werth besass. Nur aus den völlig andern Werthverhältnissen des Geldes, also auch der Stolgebühren lassen sich viele derselben überhaupt nur begreifen. So theilt Z. B. ein Geistlicher mit, dass er in seinerfrüheren Stellung nach einem alten Statut verpflichtet gewesen sei, für 15 pfennige (4 cents) nach seinem Filial zu gehen, während eine Fuhre dahin nicht unter

This distress originated mainly from the action of the government at the beginning of the present century. The coffers of the State had been exhausted in the wars against Napoleon ; to replenish the treasury the last remnants of church property were sold, and that too against the advice of Stein, the greatest of Prussian statesmen at that time, who thought that a loan of two millions, secured by mortgage on this property, would be sufficient. In the undue haste to convert it into money, much of it was sold at a merely nominal price. People were afraid to buy, because they believed that the purchases would be annulled at the first opportunity. An immense tract of land that would be worth millions at this day was bought by a Jew at the rate of one groschen per Morgen (2½ cents for three-fifths of an acre). The same Jew, fearing the annulment of the sale, immediately razed to the ground a castle that was covered with copper. Thus the property of the Church was literally squandered in the secularization period, and she became dependent upon the whims of the sovereign and of the ever-changing majorities in the legislative halls of the people.

Perhaps the reader who is accustomed to be fed with "solid theological food," when the pages of this REVIEW come before him, is tired of figures ; but we must ask him to exercise patience a little longer, because figures in this connection speak louder than words.

No one who is at all acquainted with history, can doubt the importance of the influence which Prussia has, during the last century and a half, exerted upon the destinies of Europe. While her armies were flourishing, and her military barracks springing up in different parts of the kingdom, the wants of the Church were neglected to a most lamentable extent. It is a notorious fact, that in 1851 Berlin had fewer ministers of the Gospel than in 1751. Between the years 1806 and 1850, the population increased from 120,000 to 436,000 ; during this time there was an increase of 4 in

---

1 Thlr. zu beschaffen war. In seiner städtischen Gemeinde wurde eine Grabrede in der Familie wohlhabender Bürger mit 7½ Sgr. honorirt, wo für die Hinterbliebenen oft noch die wundersamsten Prätensionen erhoben, während die Träger des Sarges für ihre Mühe ein Honorar von 15 Sgr. für die Person forderten. In Oggrose (Kreis Kalan), bezieht der Pastor an jedem hohen Festtage nach einer 200 Jahre alten Bestimmung aus der Kirchenkasse ein Revenue von 15 Pfg. 'damit er zur Stärkung seiner Gesundheit eine Flasche guten Wein trinken könne.'" Now-a-days 15 Pfg. or 4 cents would not buy a mouthful of good wine.

the ranks of the ministry. According to the statistics of 1873 there were 36 churches and 25 chapels, for a population of 763,000. The city was divided into 34 parishes, of which one had a membership of 80,000, another of 60,000, a third of 53,000, and eight others ranged from 30,000 to 40,000. In congregations of this size all pastoral care is out of the question, since in most cases there are only two ministers and one assistant to each parish. And yet most of these churches are almost empty on Sunday. Indeed, there is nothing to encourage church-going; most of the pews are kept locked until the singing of the hymn before the sermon; some of the poorer people come in and stand in the aisles, looking as lost as if they were strangers from a foreign land. No wonder that the great body of the working classes stray off into the beer-gardens, where they can at least have a seat and feel sure that they are welcome.*

Since the year 1862 the number of Prussians who study theology has decreased from 1180 to 636, and this last winter to 580. The decrease for last year was 87. There was a time when Halle alone had 800 students enrolled in this department; last semester only 204 were enrolled. Berlin had but 134 during the winter. Calculations have been made showing that at the present rate of decrease there will only be ministers for half the positions by the time the year 1885 will have come. A similar decrease has manifested itself in other parts of the empire, although the condition of the Church, especially in South Germany and the Rhine provinces, looks *much* more favorable than in Berlin.

---

*A great many little things might be related in this connection, showin what animosity the different classes of society feel towards the Church. The Evangelical Lutheran Kirchenzeitung relates that last winter a woman of Berlin requested to have her child baptized at night. The minister asked why she made such a strange request. At first she said her husband was opposed to having their child baptized, but on being questioned more closely, she confessed that her husband had no objections so far as he himself was concerned, but that he belonged to a workmen's Union, which resolved to expel every member who would henceforth allow any one of his family to be baptized.

Again, the press took great delight in circulating the report that Hegel (son of the philosopher), refused to install a young man because he wore a moustache, and that an appeal would be made to the Oberkirchenrath. The idea that this august body should waste its time over a moustache, was calculated to throw ridicule upon the highest ecclesiastical tribunal in the land.

Some of the clergy are evidently not careful enough in their conduct. Thus Dr. Baur, Prof. of Theology, and at present Rector of the University at Leipsic, gave *on Sunday evening* the ball which it is customary for the incumbent of that office to give. Some of the city clergy and their daughters attended. It gave offence to many who are religiously inclined, and who affirmed that it was contrary to custom for the Rector to give his ball on the Lord's day. On the morning of the same day I heard Dr. Baur preach on hypocritical Christianity!

These figures show beyond a doubt that there is something wrong somewhere. But it would be manifestly unjust to throw all the blame upon the hitherto existing forms of Church government. Many other forces of a much more damaging character have been at work to bring about this result. The unbelief of to-day is but a necessary historical product of the past. A large portion of our modern infidelity may be attributed to men like Voltaire and the bookseller Nicolai, because the seed sown by them sprang up and bore fruit that went to seed again, thus multiplying like the weeds of the field. The philosophical skepticism of the old schools found its way into classical German literature, and thus exerted a moulding influence upon the masses. Long after rationalism had been banished from the universities, the pulpits were disgraced by men who, instead of preaching the Gospel, delivered discourses upon agriculture and kindred subjects, e. g., at Easter upon the importance of turning cattle into pasturage at the proper time. What was thus inherited from former generations has been augmented through the influence of mistaken scientists and the destructive criticism of Strauss and Renan, whose writings have found great favor, because the results which they arrive at agree with the natural wishes of the human heart. Indeed, so great has the demand for anti-Christian literature become, that the productions of the philosopher Hartman, one of whose last works is nothing less than a funeral sermon over Christianity, meet with a sale such as neither Kant or Hegel could ever boast of.

Again, it would be unjust in this connection to ignore the good that was done by the form of Church government which came into existence in Germany during the Reformation period. Just as little as a young man, whose every action from childhood up has been watched and directed by over-anxious parents, is prepared to take care of himself when he is thrown upon the world to act independently, so little were the people of that time prepared to act independently, because for ages they had been kept under the surveillance of the hierarchy and the tutelage of princes. The spirits that were unfettered by Luther, being left to themselves while he was upon the Wartburg, ran into all sorts of extremes. The strong hand of the territorial sovereigns was required to check them in their extravagances, and to preserve peace and order. In Switzerland, where freedom had reigned for many decades, the Reformation took a different form; it had not a genius like Luther at its head, towering high above the rest; but it was rather the work of the many, so that there sprang up a system of Church government whose main feature is to be found in the Synods, where laity and clergy are equally represented. This synodical form of governing the Church spread over France, the Netherlands, England, and finally over the better half of the New World. The practical activity manifested by bodies like the Free Kirk of Scotland, is something which in the eyes of the Germans borders on the marvelous. In France, it is true, the Protestants were persecuted, because the strong hand of dukes and electors did not protect them; and undoubtedly the fact that there were no scenes in Germany like those on the night of St. Bartholomew, is due to the influence of the territorial sovereigns and to the protecting arm which they lent to the churches; nevertheless it cannot be denied that this close union of Church and State kept the former in a condition of tutelage, which ever has been and still is the source of much harm. When the laity are made to feel that they have no say in ecclesiastical matters; when the clergy are taught to expect everything from above, that is, from the coffers of the sovereign; when the formation of a new parish requires the sanction of the government; the inevitable consequences are an indifferent laity, a want of aggressive activity among the clergy, a neglect of the practical side of Christian work, and the danger of getting shepherds who care less for the flock than the fleece. The Church coercion that was kept up for centuries, requiring every child to be baptized and every young man to be confirmed before he could learn a trade, intensified the hatred of infidels and did violence to the free nature of the Gospel. And when the revolutionary movements of '48 began to agitate Europe, the Church, being dependent upon the princes, and therefore, directly under their control, was degraded in the eyes of the multitude into a police institution, and an increased estrangement of the masses was the necessary result. Moreover, the measures adopted by some monarchs who were of a theological turn of mind, must have been galling to many earnest minds, who felt attached to the symbols and customs of the Churches in which they had been brought up. Examples of this are found in the Agenda, which Frederick William III. forced upon the congregations, and in the union of the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches, which was consummated in several states against the wishes of the people. All compulsory acts of this kind are condemned by the religious consciousness of modern times.

The ecclesiastical policy inaugurated in Prussia, when the union took place, was made still more untenable by the political changes which have occurred since that time. It went on the supposition that the monarch not only executes, but also makes the laws. The movements of '48 and '50 separated these two functions of government. The year '66 added new provinces to the kingdom—provinces in which the Evangelical Churches, even as to their internal affairs, stand directly under the control of a cabinet officer, who is responsible only to the legislative bodies at Berlin. The year '71 made the imperial chancellor a cultus minister for the provinces taken from France, and according to French laws gave him most extraordinary power over the internal affairs of the Churches. And during all these changes the congregations were dumb, for they had no organs through whom they could make known their wants.

The good sense of a pious monarch, counseled by men like Dorner, came to the rescue. On September 10, 1873, King William issued an edict which permits the congregations to elect their own elders, also a board of trustees to manage the secular affairs. The same edict makes provision for district and provincial synods, and for the calling of an extraordinary General Synod for the eight older provinces. It will be the business of this General Synod to determine upon a constitution for the government of the Church and the convocation of future General Synods. The date of meeting is to be fixed by the Cultus-Minister and the President of the Oberkirchenrath. It will be composed of 150 representatives from the provincial Synods, 6 from the theological faculties and an equal number from the law faculties, 30 members appointed by the king, and the 11 general superintendents.

The representatives from the provincial synods were elected at the meetings of these synods held in February. A royal commissary was present at each session, who had the privilege of speaking or making proposals at any time. At the meetings of the General Synod the President of the Oberkirchenrath, Dr. Herrmann, will represent the king, and have the same powers and privileges as the commissaries have at the meetings of the provincial synods. These arrangements furnish another specimen of the traditional policy of the House of Hohenzollern, which on the one hand takes jealous care of the prerogatives of the crown, and on the other seeks to promote the welfare of the people by granting them a large measure of freedom.

Beneficial results have already begun to manifest themselves. The consistories of the Berlin churches held a joint meeting to make provision for some of the more pressing wants. It was partly through their influence that an increased donation was made by the government, to counterbalance the loss occasioned by the falling away of the surplice fees. A salary of at least 800 thalers is now guaranteed to every evangelical clergyman who has been in office for five years. No previous Cultus-Minister has succeeded in obtaining so much money for the clergy, and Dr. Falk is the most thoroughly abused man in the Empire.

The example of Prussia exerts a moulding influence upon the other German States. They are preparing to indemnify the Churches for the loss of the surplice fees. Several lately adopted the synodical form of church goverment; Bavaria and Würtemburg took this step more than 10 years ago. The extent to which their people are estranged from the Church has not yet come to light, because the civil marriage laws will not go into effect before next January. Nor is this in all cases a sure test. According to the statistical report of Finanz-Minister Camphausen, nearly $6\frac{1}{2}$ million taxpayers in Prussia live on an income of about 140 thalers.* Dire necessity may, therefore, oblige many to omit the ceremonies prescribed by the Church. But the decrease in the number of those who study theology is an evil which cannot be remedied by legislation. A change for the better can only be brought about by a revival of the religious life of the nation, and the purification of the theological schools. At Leipsic, where Lutheranism still retains much of its pristine purity and power, the number of theological students is nearly 400; but at those universities where the negative school of Baur and Strauss has gained the upper hand, it is possible to count the number on the fingers. Last winter Heidelberg had 9 and Giessen 8 in this department. Truly a dark future is before the Evangelical Church of Germany!

---

* In commenting on this fact the Evangelical-Lutheran Kirchenzeitung, of April 9, says: "Einzig und allein die Unterlassung der Kirchlichen Handlungen auf die Feindschaft gegen die Kirche, so gross dieselbe in der That auch immersein mag, zurüchzuführen, geht doch wol nicht au, ja faktisch wird nicht ein, mal in allen Fällen Gleichgültigkeit gegen die Kirche vorliegen. Wer aber wüsste es nicht dass Tausende Armer einen Kirchenbesuch, einen Abendmahlgang und ein Glockengeläute über den Leichen der ihregen längst nicht mehr kennen, weil

The question, which next claims attention, is:

V.

From what standpoint shall we view these ecclesiastical laws, so to be able to as pass an impartial judgment upon their merits? Both the voice of history and the nature of Christianity give the answer: From the standpoint of religious freedom.

It was Hegel who first pointed out the significance of the idea of freedom for the proper understanding of history. The keynote to his lectures on this subject is found in the proposition: Die Weltgeschichte ist der Fortschritt im Bewusztsein der Freiheit.* He says that the Orientals simply knew that one was free, viz: the despot; that the Greeks and Romans knew that some were free,

---

zum Sonntags-oder Trauerkleid und zu irgend einer Leichenfeier das Geld fehlte? Es ist nur das Analoge zu dem allen, dass auch zu einem Hochzeitskleide, zu dem wenn auch geringsten Festaufwande, den eine Hochzeit erfordert dasselbe Geld nicht mehr beschaft, und darum der gang an den Altar zur Kirchl. Trauung unterlassen, oft erst vorläufig aufgeschoben, und dann ganz versäumt wird." In this pauperism lies, perhaps, a greater danger for the German Empire than in Ultramontanism itself. The laws making the possession of a certain amount of property a condition of marriage, have been abolished; hence there is no limit to the indefinite multiplication of the lower classes. Many a father speculates with despair upon the future prospects of the children that are growing up around him; hence communism is daily gaining ground. The recent laws tending to check emigration, only serve to bottle up the discontent of certain classes, and sooner or later there may be an outbreak, if the hallowing and restraining influence of Christianity do not produce a change of sentiment among the masses.

*Phil. d. Geschichte. Page 22, 3d edition.

namely, themselves, the rest of mankind being slaves; but that we know that man as such is free; or in other words, the modern world has come to the consciousness of man's freedom as man. No one can reasonably dispute the general correctness of the last remark. There is an unmistakable tendency in modern history to free the individual from the false powers that bind him, be they those of superstition, tradition, authority, or civil or ecclesiastical tyranny. The modern State feels itself called upon to protect its citizens in every legitimate form of activity. Freedom of speech, of the press, of conscience, of religious worship, have become the watchwords of the century in which we live. Legislators have begun to recognize that they have no right to interfere with the manner in which the individual deems it his duty to serve his God, so long as he does not endanger the public peace or trespass upon the rights of his fellow-men. How different the theories as well as the practice of rulers during the middle ages! Then religious freedom was a thing unknown, fire being the proper remedy for heresy. The rulers of the House of Hohenzollern were among the first to inaugurate a better state of things. They offered an asylum to those who were banished from their homes on account of their religious beliefs. Frederick the Great declared that in his dominions every man might go to heaven in the way that seemed to him best. But full religious freedom first became a permanent part of the civil code in the colony founded by William Penn, in the New World. While New England was staining its record by persecutions and banishments, the Quaker fathers offered a home and equal civil rights to persons of every creed and confession. The same principle was adopted by the statesmen who framed the Constitution of the United States. Great Britain and the nations of northern Europe have made rapid strides towards the same goal; Italy, Japan and Spain have but lately fallen into line; and although some of these governments still hesitate to adopt the maxim, that all who bear equal burdens shall enjoy equal rights, nevertheless the descendants of the Quaker fathers may congratulate themselves over the fact, that the banner of universal religious tolerance now waves in every country upon the civilized globe. Surely if there be a God in history—and no sane philosopher can have any doubts on this point—it is the will of that God that every human being shall worship Him according to the dictates of his own conscience.

The charge of intolerance has somatimes been made against Christianity, but with manifest injustice. A religion which professes to be the only true religion can, to be sure, not look with indifference upon the conduct of those who turn away from her; but the only weapons which her founders authorized her to employ for the conversion of the world, are those of persuasion and prayer. Alexander, Cæsar and Napoleon founded their empires upon blood and the sword; Christ founded His kingdom upon freedom and love. When James and John suggested the propriety of calling down fire from heaven to consume those who would not receive Him, He rebuked them, saying: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." (Luke ix. 53–56.) His disciples went forth proclaiming a gospel which gradually broke down the barriers of sex, slavery and nationality, in that it taught the universal brotherhood of all men and their absolute equality before God, giving woman her true position in society, and preparing the way for the abolition of slavery by laying stress upon the inalienable rights of man as man. These rights, it was held, involved religious freedom and the exclusion of all coercion of the conscience.*

After Christianity had conquered the Roman Empire, some of its adherents, forgetful of their Master's precepts and intoxicated with victory, used violent measures in making conversions, justifying themselves on the principle that it is beneficial to coerce men by fear and bodily pain for purposes of subsequent instruction; but these deeds of violence do not prove anything against the liberal tendency of the Gospel. It is a common weakness of men to formulate their interests into general theories; besides, as often as Christianity, in its purity and simplicity, was allowed to mould the thinking of the individual, it resulted in the advocacy of religious tolerance. Thus Luther declared heresy to be a spiritual thing, which could not be cut by iron, or burned by fire, or drowned in water; his appeal was to God's Word. He constantly advocated that no one should be coerced in matters of faith; that liberty should be given to every man to accept or reject the sacraments; that the proclamation of the Gospel was the proper means to be employed for the conversion of the world. The condition of the Christian Church at the present day bears testimony to the wisdom of the great Reformer. In those countries where religious coercion of any kind has existed for many years, the Church has been degraded more or less into a servant of the State, the activity of her membership has been paralyzed, and the hatred of infidelity has been greatly embittered and envenomed; whereas in those countries where perfect religious freedom reigns, the Church has not only shown that she is abundantly able to take care of herself, but also developed among her membership a degree of activity in missionary and other work perhaps hitherto unparalleled in the world's history, if we except the days of early Christianity.

---

* Humani juris et naturalis potestatis est unicuique, quod putaverit, colere.—*Tertull. ad Scapulam I.*

Judging the above enactments by this standard, we find much to commend, as well as some things which we cannot approve of. Taken as a whole, they are evidently a big step forwards in the direction of religious freedom. At one stroke they sweep away a host of abuses, which had accumulated during centuries. Parents are no longer obliged to have their children baptized, and to contribute directly towards the support of religious institutions which they do not approve of. Persons can now get married without being obliged to submit to the requirements of the canon law, or any other arbitrary regulations which the established Churches may see fit to make. The individual can now, without losing any of his civil rights, separate himself from a religious society having corporate privileges, and thus secure exemption from the contributions which his membership involves. The clergy are no longer absolutely dependent upon their superiors, because the simple dictum of a bishop is no longer sufficient to deprive them of office and of their daily bread, or to confine them in a house of correction against their will. Priests are no longer required to perform the marriage ceremony contrary to the dictates of conscience. Particularly worthy of commendation is the feature which gives the laity a voice in the management of the secular affairs of the Church.

Other features which at first sight look like an infringement upon religious liberty, lose their objectionable character on closer examination. Thus the act requiring the marriage contract in all cases to be made before a civil magistrate, and the one specifying certain limitations to the discipline which the churches exercise over their members. It is the mutual consent of the parties which consummates the marriage; if they choose to call in the aid of a minister or a priest after they have complied with the civil regulations, the law has no objections, and throws no impediments in their way. The other statute, while it allows discipline within the purely religious sphere, does away with several gross abuses. It, for instance, prevents Protestant clergymen from insulting a deflowered bride at the altar by tearing from her head the wreath which virgins are permitted to wear on such occasions as a mark of honor. It forbids the Jewish ban and the excommunicatio major, which prohibit all intercourse between the faithful and the one thus punished (an exception being, however, made by both in the case of wife and children). It imposes heavy penalties upon priests who abuse their powers of discipline for the purpose of controlling elections. The priest might, of course, complain of an infringment upon the freedom of his conscience when he is prevented from employing all his powers for purposes which he believes to be right. But the question here is: "Does the State or the Church most clearly express the will of God?—the State which requires that every man act according to his conscience, or the Church which requires that he shall not, and threatens him with awful penalties if he does?" To ask such a question is equal to answering it. The election franchise is given to the citizen on the condition that he exercise it according to the dictates of his judgment; others may try to influence him by persuasion; but it is evidently not legitimate that railroad corporations or religious societies should control his vote by threats of material or spiritual injury. Intimidation of every sort at public elections is contrary to the fundamental principles of constitutional government. It is a maxim of law, recognized by the English courts, that the civil rights of the citizen must not be encroached upon by Church discipline; for "where religious freedom encroaches upon civil liberty it becomes religious tyranny."

But how is it with reference to the powers vested in the Royal Tribunal for ecclesiastical affairs, and the regulations concerning the education and the appointment of the clergy? Evidently here lies the bone of contention between the two parties. Only a priesthood trained to absolute obedience and unconditionally under the control of the Curia, will subserve the purposes of a hierarchy like that of the Roman Church. To train such a priesthood, she needs the seminaries which the Prussian Government has suppressed. These seminaries admitted boys of twelve years of age, separated them from the influences of family life and of the free currents of popular opinion which flow through the nation's veins, subjected them during many years to the discipline of strict laws, and gave them time and means to ground themselves deeply in the spirit of the Church before entering upon their life-work. A priest trained according to this method was, of course, more attached to Rome than to his fatherland; if his training did not suffice to make him take the side of his Church on every question, his daily necessities placed his decision beyond doubt; for having been educated with an eye single to the priesthood, he was thereby totally unfitted for other avocations, and if deprived of his benefice the only alternative left him was to earn his daily bread by hard manual labor. It is not difficult to surmise the results of such a system. Being invested in the eyes of the faithful with the power to forgive sins and to release from punishments in purgatory, the priesthood may exercise unlimited influence in a country governed by representatives of the people, examples of which are seen in Belgium and the United States. Moreover, since both bishops and priests are absolutely dependent upon the Pope, this influence may be employed to undermine a government acting contrary to the interests of the Curia. Now it cannot be denied that Prussia, in trying to avert this danger, has acted with commendable moderation. The Falk laws make no specifications in reference to the kind and the amount of theological training which the candidate for orders shall receive; they do not oblige him to attend the lectures of a single Protestant professor; they simply demand that his general training be not neglected, and that he be acquainted with philosophy, history, and German literature, branches which are calculated to inspire his bosom with feelings of patriotism and devotion to his fatherland. They make provision for the closing of all boys' seminaries, and in this they save the boy from having a destiny forced upon him before he has reached the years of discretion. An adult may deprive himself of the benefits of family and national life; but it is evidently the duty of the State to see to it, that a boy be not cut off from proper educating influences, no matter whether it be a cotton factory or a monastic institute that tries to have him make a sacrifice of himself.

The Royal Judicatory for ecclesiastical affairs does not offer any opportunity to the king or to his ministers for interfering arbitrarily with the internal affairs of the Churches; for the members which compose it cannot be changed with every passing whim of the monarch and his advisers, because five are appointed for life, and the remaining six continue in office until the expiration of their term of office in the regular courts. The extent of their jurisdiction is accurately specified by law: 1. They are competent to consider and decide upon all appeals from acts of discipline, made on the plea of the illegality of such acts. 2. They examine and decide cases in which the State authorities bring an indictment for dismissal from office against a bishop or priest, on the ground that his further continuance in office is incompatible with the public peace. 3. They decide appeals from the decisions and instructions of the Cultus-Minister, in reference to the closing of and with holding money from Catholic seminaries. 4. They decide appeals from the protest of their president against what he deems illegal appointments of clergymen. (He is required to make this protest whenever he thinks that the act of May 11, 1873, is violated.) It is evident from these regulations that the Tribunal under consideration was established with a view of preventing all arbitrariness on the part of the king and his servants, as well as on the part of the bishops and their assistants.

Still we cannot approve of everything in these enactments. The State has evidently no right to punish a priest or bishop for exercising purely spiritual functions. That a prelate should be punished by the civil authorities for preparing the chrismal oil, no matter what his antecedents may have been, is an encroachment upon religious freedom, which can not but irritate the faithful. The State may withhold the money it pays to an established church, deprive a disobedient priest of his benefice, and even imprison or banish him, if his presence becomes dangerous to the public peace; but she has no right to interfere with him when he exercises the purely spiritual functions of an office to which his superiors have appointed him. As long as Church and State are united, it may be impossible to avoid such interference without making the law contemptible; because, if the State raises the taxes by which a bishop is paid, she must of course demand that he obey her laws; if he refuses to do so, the only way left is to punish him, and in case of continued obstinacy to deprive him of office, just as in the case of any other officer acting contrary to the civil code. The Catholic Church feels this keenly enough; her adherents have repeatedly asked for a separation of Church and State after the pattern of ouy own country. But as long as Prussia paid to them three times as much money as to the Protestant Church, although the ratio of Catholics to Protestants in the kingdom was that of 11 to 18, the prelates had nothing but words of praise for the ecclesiastical polity of the government. Besides, the Syllabus expressly condemns the separation of Church and State. Nor can we believe that the Romish Church would make any opposition to these laws, if she was solely concerned for the spiritual welfare of her people. But she is aiming to regain her lost supremacy. According to her theory, all baptized persons belong to the Pope; members of the Greek and the Protestant Churches are lost sheep, whom it is her duty to bring back to the true fold; and in her eyes Prussia is the greatest barrier which prevents her from accomplishing this much-desired end. In Catholic countries her bishops are allowed to obey civil regulations equally stringent; but in Prussia, the great stronghold of Protestantism, this will never do; opposition to everything which tends to strengthen the State, is here the only legitimate policy. "The contest against the Catholic Church," says a correspondent of the *Voce della Veritá*, the official organ of the Curia, "will continue in Prussia, in one form or another, as long as Prussia exists. For the true and principal cause of the contest lies in the innermost nature of this State. . . . Prussia, in her present organization (in seiner jetzigen Gestalt und Zusammensetzung), is based upon Protestantism and its teachings. Prussia is the bulwark and stronghold of Protestant Germany. Upon Prussia are directed the eyes of all those, who have separated themselves from the Catholic Church in consequence of the lamentable strife in the 16th century. In Prussia the natural and inexhaustible stream of opposition to Rome takes its rise....The contest against the Church in Europe stands and falls with Prussia."*

Looking at the matter from the standpoint of religious freedom, we cannot but in the main justify the policy which Prussia pursues. Paradoxical as it may at first sight seem, she is in this contest the defender of religious liberty. Wherever Rome has the power to act in strict accordance with her traditions, intolerance is the consequence. Indeed, if she is true to her principles, she cannot act otherwise. Regarding herself as the only true Church, and hence as the only legitimate bearer of Christianity, the Roman Catholic Church can never concede that forms of worship and of ecclesiastical government, other than those she sanctions, have any right to exist. Hence Innocent X. issued a bull annulling the peace of Westphalia, because the articles thereof "grant the free exercise of their religion to the heretics of the so-called Augsburg Confession." It will not do to say that this is a relic of a by-gone age, having no force in the 19th century. The Curia may at times change its tactics; but it never changes it principles. The Syllabus expressly claims that the Catholic faith should be established in all countries as the only State religion, every other cultus being excluded. This really was the case in the late domains of the Church; and recent developments in Spain point in the same direction. When the bishops returned from Rome they requested the State to assist them in suppressing the Old Catholic movement; but the House of Hohenzollern, true to its traditionary policy, refused to interfere with the religious freedom of the individual, and thus became involved in a conflict far more dangerous than the one with France, inasmuch as the internal peace of the Empire has been disturbed. Still, the final issue cannot be doubtful. A good cause is sure to triumph at last. Prince Bismarck may have made some mistakes in carrying on the warfare against Ultramontanism, since even he is not infallible (much less Pius IX.); the party which he leads may have taken up some untenable positions; but when they come to abandon these, it will no more be a defeat for their cause than when a general withdraws his army from a weak position to one that is more impregnable. Those principles of religious liberty

---

[*] Taken from a quotation by the celebrated Dr. Mejer in his address entitled: Um was streiten wir mit den Ultramontanen?

and individual freedom which the Prussian government advocates, over against the efforts of the Curia, are grounded in the immutable nature of man; and neither the well organized efforts of a hierarchy, nor the most skillfully constructed machinery of a police institution, can ever succeed in suppressing them. The boon of religious freedom, which humanity has at last won after having passed through many bloody struggles in successive ages, will surely never be lost; the conflict against the Curia, which is now raging in both hemispheres, will certainly not end without some good results; and it may be that the time is nigh at hand when but few will lend a listening ear to bishops who complain of oppression, because the State refuses to assist them in coercing the conscience of others in matters of faith.*

Some may be disposed to censure the tardiness of the govern-

---

*Mejer's Address, page 6: "Gleichzeitig, als die Fälle bischöflich verlangten, staatlich abgelehnten Einschreitens gegen Altkatholiken sich mehrten, hielten die preussischen Bischöfe angezeigt, die Versagung dieser Staatshülfe für Unterdrücking der Katholischen Kirche zur erklären." (Hirtenbrief v. 30, Mai, 1871.) After summing up the points involved in this conflict between the Curia and Germany, this great canonist says (p. 32): "Aber Alles tritt zurück hinter Dem, wofür wir an erster Stelle einzustehen haben: der Gerwissensfreiheit. Mag es sich in diesen Kampfe anderwärts um Anderes handlen, in Deutschland streiten wir zuerst um sie. Allerdings nicht erst seit vier Jahren. Aber das Vaticanische Concilium, indem es die Mächte, welche der Gewissensfreiheit feindlich sind, energischer zusammengefasst, und mit dem Worte, dass der Papst Stellvertreter Christi sei, Ernst machend es in der That untermommen hat, einen Menschen auf den Thron Gottes zu setzen, stellt uns vor ein Entweder-Oder. Es fragt sich, müssen wir uns der Autorität dieses *Menschen* unterwerfen oder darf unser evangelisches Gewissen noch *in Gott* gebunden sein—Der ganze Ernst unserer deutschen reformatorischen Arbeit, der ganze Schatz göttlicher Wahrheit, welchen Luther, der deutsche Mann Gottes, und die übrigen Väter der Reformation wieder klar gestellt hatten, die ganze Gedankenwelt, in deren Vertretung seitdem das deutsche Volk seinen Beruf in der Geschichte des Geistes gefunden hat, stehen auf dem Spiel, Noch hat jeder Deutsche auf Gewissensfreiheit ein gutes Recht. Es fragt sich: Soll das aufhören?" In a speech delivered April 19, 1875, in the Abgeordnetenhaus, the historian Sybel said: "Als der milde Pius VII. mit der Bairischen Regierung über gewisse Concessionen verhandelte, welche von der letzteren gewünscht wurden, stellte er als Bedingung den Abschluss eines Concordats auf folgenden Grundlagen: Die Bairische Regierung macht sich anheischig, das Lutherthum zu vertilgen, die Glaubensfreiheit abzuschaffen, das kanonische Recht, in vollem Umfange als Bairisches Landrecht auzuerkennen; die Schule und Presse unter strenge Aufsichtzu stellen, den Klerus von allen Steuern und der welthichen Gerichtsbarkeit zu entziehen. * * Sind ihnen die Gebete nicht bekannt geworden, die 1864 der Erzbischof von Köln für die aus rottung der Ketzer angeordnet hat." *Cf.* also his "Klerikale Politik in 19ten Jahrhundert," pages 25, 89, 98.

ment in granting entire independence to the Evangelical Church. But this could not have been done all at once without giving rise to the evils of a sect system like our own. The Church is still grappling with Rationalism, Pantheism and Materialism—words which are not natives of German soil, but which have been naturalized, because that which they denote found a home at the Universities. The Church will without doubt come out victorious in the end; but, at present, numberless shades and degrees of difference prevail in the theological thinking of her great divines. Besides, the proceedings at some of the provincial synods showed clearly enough that a Church can only be trained to take care of herself by gradual emancipation. Some were anxious to pass resolutions excluding from Church membership all who neglected the regulations of the Churches in reference to marriage. But as there were no definite regulations on this point—even Luther and Melancthon differed on divorce—this might have set up as many popes as there were pulpits in the land. Furthermore, many congregations might not have been able to support their pastors; for liberality can only be taught by long training, and the six and a half million paupers already spoken of would be unable to contribute much, even if they felt so inclined. In view of these facts, it would be unjust to blame the government for not separating Church and State at a single stroke. Dr. Falk has openly declared that he feels it his duty to promote the independence of the former over against himself, and the conflict with Rome has aided his efforts to a wonderful extent. The pastors have been relieved of their secular duties, so that they can now devote themselves more assiduosly to the care of their flocks; the laity have received a voice in ecclesiastical matters, so that they may be brought into sympathy with the work of the Church; provision has been made for the establishment of a system of synods, through which the wants of the Church can be made known and her affairs managed in an independent way. These measures are calculated to work a great change in the course of time. When a German devotes himself to any undertaking, he goes into it with all the ardor of his soul; if he becomes religious, it moulds and gives color to all the actions of his every-day life. Hence we need not despair of the Protestant Church in Germany. Like the children of Israel, she is being led through the wilderness to chasten and prepare her for the promised land. Like the barge which carried the disciples across the sea of Galilee, she may for a time be tossed to and fro by adverse winds and upon storm-troubled waters; but her Lord has not lost sight of her, and in His own good time He will come to her and "bring her into the desired haven, in ways that are marvelous and past finding out."

In conclusion, it may be well to view our country for a moment in the light of these events. Different voices have of late been raised to warn us of coming danger, and to admonish us not to spend our energies in disputing about minor points of difference. To one who has studied the nature of the conflicts in other lands, some things indeed look like adumbrations of an approaching storm. Nowhere does the Catholic Church make more rapid progress than in the United States. Her forces are thoroughly disciplined and skillfully marshaled; she is doing her best to gain a foothold in every thriving town in the Union. She protests against our system of Common Schools; her bishops instruct the people how to vote on this and on other questions which involve her interests. Some of the States have already seen fit to enact laws against mortmain. To prevent the abuse of priestly power at death-beds, the statute-book of Pennsylvenia annuls every bequest to a religious society, if it is not made a month before the death of the testator; in New York, Michigan and Iowa, the term set is two months; in Delaware it is fixed at one year. But it is not legitimate for a State to go beyond protecting the rights of the individual; nor is it necessary. For if Protestantism could not maintain itself by its own inherent strength, it would deserve to go down. So long as we have faith in our faith, we must be willing to abide by this test. In one respect, we should rather rejoice than mourn over the successes of the Catholic Church. It is evidently better that a man belong to some Church than to no Church at all; and we should certainly not object if the Catholic Church brings the influence of the Gospel to bear upon any portion of the ten or fifteen millions of our people who hold themselves aloof from, or at least stand in no visible connection with, Christianity. He, who seeks a perfect church upon earth, will find himself seeking in vain. Both Protestantism and Catholicism have their faults and their weaknesses.

But we look forward with hope to the Church of the future—to that higher and more perfect form of Christianity, which is destined to take up and unite Christians of every clime and country into one grand visible communion. The Saviour's followers will continue to cherish this hope, even if it should not go into fulfillment until the breaking in of that morn when time shall melt into eternity.

Leipzig, April 26, 1875.

ART. III.—SHOULD THE STATE CONTRIBUTE TO THE SUPPORT OF THE CHURCH?

BY LEWIS H. STEINER.

THE relation of the Church to the State has been a topic of discussion for years, and much rhetoric, with a modicum of theology and philosophy, has been expended by those who have felt called upon to enter the lists. One party recognizes the visible Church as of paramount importance, and when it had undisputed sway in Europe the pages of history show how terrible and tyrannous was its treatment of the civil authorities—how crowned heads were compelled in the garb of supplicants to perform menial services, dignitaries of State to become the pliant tools of ecclesiastical functionaries, learning to hide its head in the presence of self-sufficient pretense, and culture and refinement of all kinds either to develop along a miserable narrow groove, or to remain in an embryonic condition. The State, in the opinion of this party, was a synonym for the kingdom of Satan;—withdrawal from all obligations of allegiance and service to it, a duty on the part of every man or woman who wished to attain the highest possible condition of sanctification. Another party, rushing to the opposite extreme, ignores all obligations to the Church whatever, and seeing in the State nothing more than a form for securing life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to the greatest number, considers her origin as purely human, depending upon the consent of the governed, and hence subject to change at their whim. It has always such expressions as "priest-ridden," "priest-craft," to apply without stint to those who fondly believe that in the Church they have a life to live as well as in the State, and to those who earnestly strive to carry out the Saviour's command, to preach the gospel to every creature. The Church, to this party in its extreme form, is a barrier to all intellectual and scientific progress, is only fitted for the weak and timid, and necessarily enervates every manly soul found within her limits. The action of the Inquisition in the case of Galileo is cited as a typical specimen of what may be expected, under any and all circumstances, at her hands.

The one party degrades the State to the condition of a mere constabulary force to keep order, to punish crime and to furnish the necessary material aid for its own support; the other either ignores the Church altogether and prates loudly about virtue and morality as graces of nature, or recognizes it as furnishing occupation for the gentler sex and children, who are too weak to grapple with the problem of life without some assistance of the kind. The former necessarily becomes, when allowed absolute freedom, autocratic and tyrannous;—disregarding and trampling upon all individual rights, it speedily produces a slavery of the most abject and pitiable kind: the latter tends to the destruction of all the advantages and the restraints of religion, then to the overthrow of constitutional liberty, and finally to the apotheosis of the individual will as the sole rule and guide in human affairs. The former tends to miserable slavery, the latter to horrible anarchy.

Of course there are manifold shades of opinion on this subject, and the extreme results just noticed—which were really attained in countries where the Inquisition reigned without dispute, and in France during the first Revolution—are but rarely met with on the pages of history. Mankind in modern times has not shown a willingness to allow either Church or State to crush each other, and is beginning to be incredulous as to the necessary existence of an antagonism between the two. It is disposed to recognize the fact that each has a sphere separate and distinct from the other, in which it can move successfully, and for the advantage of its members, and that when most prosperous it is most free from the trammels of unnatural dependence. It also begins to see that the State is of divine constitution, and has a power altogether independent of individual will, although the form it may assume shall result from the choice of the majority of the people over which it asserts its power with authority. Of course such a tendency is in direct opposition to that spirit which makes out "that the Church as clerically organized appropriates God's calling, and is alone holy; and that the world as organized under civil government, is altogether outside of that calling which makes holy," and that "quotes our Lord's saying, 'Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's,' as if Cæsar meant civil government and God meant ecclesiastical government, and as if Cæsar and God had separate jurisdictions, each limiting the other."* It leads also to our appreciation of the meaning of Hooker's words, when he says of law, "all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power; both angels and men and creatures of what condition soever, though each in *different* sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."

The policy of this country has been to keep Church and State separate, with the hope that each may thus best perform the functions peculiar to it, without injuring or being injured by the other. This policy is the result of dissatisfaction with the results attained in countries where the State has been subservient to the Church, where the State has dominated and controlled it, or where it has totally ignored its existence, and put even Christianity itself under the ban. Not all of our first settlers were driven to these shores with ideas of tolerance for all shades of religious belief, and of opposition to an alliance with civil government. Some came because they wished to worship God according to their own peculiar notions, and hence they were intolerant to those who pronounced shibboleth after a different standard. They either reluctantly allowed such to pursue their own religious practices, or they banished them from their borders. And with the view of being able to secure the permanent establishment of their own denominations, they made the State conform to their views. The experiment here, however, led to the same result that had been attained abroad. The

---

*Sermon on "The Church and the World," by Rev. J. Llewellyn Davies, M. A.

Church and State were claimed to be—in the present stage of development of the race—most prosperous when allowed to perform their respective functions independently of each other. The very first amendment proposed to the Constitution of 1787, two years thereafter, by Congress, provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" and Judge Paschal, in his Annotated Constitution, after showing that the word "establishment here means a system of religion recognized and supported by the State," and that religion is employed to signify "a particular system of faith or worship," says that "the real object of the amendment was, not to countenance, much less to advance Mahometanism, or Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity: but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment which would give to a hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government." It was proposed in the same spirit that prompted the clause in the sixth article, which says that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." Paschal also says that "No religious test was, doubtless, used in the sense of the statute of 25 Charles II., which required an oath and declaration against transubstantiation, which all officers, civil and military, were formerly obliged to take within six months after their admission. The object was to cut off all pretense of alliance between Church and State."

And yet the founders of our government would have been ready to admit that the "sovereignty of the nation is from God, and of the people. The representative of its sovereignty is therefore responsible to God and accountable to the people. The power is transmitted through no intermediate hands; the people is invested with it, in all its majesty, in the nation founded in the law of a moral person and derivative from God alone."* This recognition of an absolute dependence upon God was so self-evident that the framers of the Constitution did not consider it essential to have a formal statement of it in that document, and would have had little appreciation of the zeal of those in modern times who wish a special amendment to state a fact that is the condition precedent to the existence of the nation itself. Mulford well says, on this point: "In the historical or providential—the real and unwritten constitution—it (the recognition of God) is the very condition of the being of the nation. But the written or enacted constitution defines only the formal organization, and relations of the powers of the State, and then also it is an instrument of law, and subject to amendment, etc., and the divine recognition might be required with the same propriety in every legislative enactment."*

---

*Mulford's Nation, 53.

Although our government has been thus carefully framed so as to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, and to allow free scope for the worship of God according to their own peculiar views to all men, yet it is not atheistic; it recognizes the existence of God the Father, as the Creator and Governor of the earth and its inhabitants, in a number of ways which show its belief much more satisfactorily than a mere formal statement would. Indeed, it would not be very difficult to show that the State, as presented to us in our country, recognizes the divinity of Christ, and is essentially Christian. Lieber goes so far in his Political Ethics, I., 370, as to mention Christianity as the most active of the causes of the present condition of civilization.

The Church is not to be interfered with. In whatever form her dogmas may crystallize, no perturbating agency can be tolerated, but on the contrary must be suppressed with all the power at the command of the State. Only when the Church goes outside of her province and secularizes herself, or strives to control that which is secular, does the State in this land assume a threatening aspect towards her. Then, and then only, it says, thus far shalt thou go. Representing a kingdom which is in the world and not of it, so long as her aspirations, her resolves, her utterances, her actions are confined to this kingdom, the State is ready to protect and defend her. Her warfare is not against flesh and blood, her armor is not of this world, but that which is peculiar to a disciple of Christ, so well set forth by Saint Paul in the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians. In the past her members have brought disgrace upon her by their efforts to control the secular organizations of the world, a disgrace attended by such spiritual darkness as almost entirely obscured the light she should have spread abroad. Hence her own integrity, as well as the safety of the State, demands that she should leave to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.

---

*Mulford's Nation, 381.

With this recognition of the two separate and distinct spheres occupied by the Church and the State, and without attempting to define the exact relation held by the one to the other, let us now endeavor to answer the question: "Should the State contribute to the support of the Church?" And while this question, abstractly considered, may seem to elicit but one answer, and that an affirmative one, yet there are forms of *contribution* which the experience of the past and the judgment of the present have shown to be prejudicial to the Church, as well as detrimental to the State, and which must hence be classed as exceptions to such an affirmative answer. This exceptional character it is hoped will be recognized by the reader before we close.

There are three modes in which the State can contribute to the support of the Church, by throwing protection around her members in the performance of all their religious duties, by respecting and reverencing her rites and ceremonies, and by direct pecuniary contributions, or indirectly by relieving her from the burden of taxation which is levied upon the people to support the State. It may hence show its disposition towards the Church by offering *legal*, *moral* or *pecuniary* support.

1. *Legal Support*. The State should furnish protection to the Church in the way of guaranteeing all the rights of her members, because it is its duty to protect its citizens and to secure to them in fullest measure all such rights. Their lives and health are to be guarded by positive enactments and by prohibitory legislation, duly enforced through officers appointed for such purpose. Provision must not only be made for the removal of that which will threaten life and peril health, but for the securing of conditions that will conduce to health and be favorable to longevity. Their freedom of will must not be crushed by the demands of absolute authority, and the requirements of absolute obedience. They must be allowed *coelum tueri*, and not be forced to bend under the lash of despotic power, or to cringe before unfeeling autocracy. And, along with this, their personal liberty should be secured, so that

they may come or go at will so long as they are not violating the rights of others or the laws of the State. Again, liberty of thought needs freedom of expression to make it of any value, hence the State should protect the right of free utterance, unless it may endanger its own integrity and safety under certain abnormal conditions, as in time of civil or foreign war. "The State must not interfere with thought. No authority, man, or body, has a right to disturb my communion with my fellow-men, by whatever means of utterance I choose. * * The State has no right either to interfere with what I shall read, * * or with what I shall say by way of writing to others; but it has the bounden duty to protect this my primordial right, and wait till I abuse it; as it does not tie my arms to prevent theft or murder, but waits until the use my limbs has been abused."*

Further, the State must protect and hold inviolate the moral purity of its citizens; *i. e.* it must not allow that to be done which will cause a destruction of their virtue or a positive lapse into immorality and crime. It must guarantee rights and protect from wrongs, but not tempt or induce to their commission. Injuries to honor and reputation must be punished, and the aegis of protection held in front of the character of the humblest when unjustly assailed, without reference to the greater whence the assault may come. It must not only furnish all this protection to every citizen, but to all the members of his family—his wife, children, servants, and the stranger that is in the sacred position of a guest within his walls. All these are entitled to most earnest support from the State in the rights which have been so rapidly enumerated—in their jural relations—besides leaving them at liberty to acquire property and employ the same, conditioned only by the laws enacted by the State on the subject, to dispose of the same at will, and if so inclined to change allegiance and residence from one geographical region to another.

But in a higher capacity than as composed of mere citizens, does the Church present itself when demanding political support from the State. They were both founded and instituted by the same Almighty authority, and all the principles upon which morality and virtue are based have been derived from the truths entrusted to her keeping. Their highest form is attained by those who most strikingly and truthfully illustrate the doctrines of the Head of the Church; who strive to imitate His example in their daily walk and converse with their fellow men; who look upon Jesus Christ as the highest embodiment of humanity, and find in His life and teachings, that which should be the norm of their own lives. Whatever is binding in the idea of law, whatever separates it from its counterfeit—*might* or brute force, whatever displays the idea of liberty as freedom under the limiting and controlling influence of law,—in fine, whatever is greatest, grandest, and noblest in the life of the State has been derived from the Church, either through the written Word, which she has guarded for the world, or through means of its traditions.

---

* Leiber's Political Ethics, I., 184.

Hence as a means of securing the perpetuity of those principles upon which her laws are framed and her institutions founded, of extending the beneficial influence of that civilization, whose most active influencing cause has been Christianity, and of strengthening and increasing the number of citizens who are to give character to her at home and abroad, the State must protect and support the Church, with all the power it may possess, from any molestation whatever. The instinct of self-preservation impels it to do this. It must protect places of worship from injury, and worshipers themselves from external disturbance. It must see that the peculiar religious views of any one form of Christianity are not interfered with by those who see the truth through different media of interpretation, that all are alike protected from interference. As it requires from those who hold offices of honor, trust or emolument, before they can enter upon their duties, an oath or declaration, in the presence of God, as to their intention to act without fear, favor or partiality, so must it take every care to defend those who worship that God in their efforts to proclaim the truths that He has revealed for the guidance of His followers. As it demands at the hands of those who are called upon to testify in its courts a similar appeal to the Supreme Being, that the evidence they are to present is the truth and nothing but the truth, so must it, if but with the hope of preventing perjury under such circumstances, avail itself of every opportunity to offer its protection to those who are striving to disseminate the doctrines, and to preach the gospel of Him who is the Truth Himself. As marriage is almost universally solemnized by the aid of a minister of a church, and, even if the service is performed entirely by a civil officer, is recognized as "an honorable estate, *instituted* of God in the time of man's innocency," being peculiar to those people where the religion of the Bible prevails and only *exceptionally* found where it is not prevalent, it is its interest to uphold and sustain the Church which teaches the inviolability of the marriage vow to all who hearken to her teachings. And thus for manifold reasons, but all springing from necessity and collectively taken, rising to the dignity of an imperative duty, the State is bound to contribute to the support of the Church in the way of furnishing whatever protection she may need to secure her from violence, and to guarantee her a free, unrestrained, undisturbed arena for the exercise of her peculiar functions. While jealous in modern times of dictation from the actual Church, the State has always recognized the force of this duty, and in our own country has performed it with commendable zeal and alacrity.

2. *Moral Support.* The relation of the two necessitating the contribution of legal support towards the Church having been thus briefly alluded to, we can now direct our attention to another form of support which the State should voluntarily and cheerfully furnish. It is the privilege of the State to foster and encourage everything, every enterprise, every organization that is directed towards the improvement of its citizens, because its glory consists in "men who their duties know," and not in

> "High rais'd battlement or labored mound,
> Thick walls or moated gate,
> Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned;
> Not bays or broad-armed ports,
> Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride."

Its encouragement is due to all efforts to increase the number of such citizens, while the kingdom that the Christian considers as his peculiar home is "an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," still the very life that he is forced to lead on his way to that home makes him the best type of a citizen—makes him just the man to hold with credit to the State any position for which his intellectual qualifications fit him.

It is a privilege for the State to afford the moral support of recognition to the Church. It shows enlightened views and appreciation of that organization in which is nurtured and developed those who will most suitably bear its honors and wield its powers. It dare not be satisfied with merely furnishing the legal support which it must give as a right; it must go further. No parent performs his whole duty by simply providing for the physical and intellectual wants of his child; he must not be indifferent to the education of its moral nature. Similarly the State must not be indifferent to the success of all efforts to educate the moral natures of its citizens, and cannot consider its measure of duty filled if their physical and intellectual wants have only been satisfied. But as the Church has unfortunately been divided into many different denominations, arising from differences as to dogma—mostly, however, in minor particulars—the State cannot discriminate between these and set itself up as the discoverer of what is orthodox and what heterodox. It must, therefore, look upon them all, so long as their members do not interfere with each other, with like favor and recognition. Of course difficulties very perplexing will arise in the effort to do this, but the State can go no further in *its* capacity than to acknowledge all as equally entitled to its commendation who worship the true God and believe that "He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him."

It can make this recognition by selecting for its posts of honor and responsibility preferably—other things being equal—those who illustrate the value of the Church's teachings in their lives, and who esteem a good name and a strict adherence to the moral law as above all other real or imaginary possessions. It can discountenance vice and fraud, and keep from its public councils those who prefer double dealing to honesty and candor. Thus will the State honor itself by honoring those who pursue the ways of religion. It can also further extend this recognition by availing itself of religious services at the opening of its most important councils, by closing its offices on that day recognized as sacred to rest from labor by Divine command, by setting apart secular days in times of great bounty or privation for thanksgiving or fasting, by guarding public worship from all external molestation or unseemly disturbance. By all such free, voluntary efforts on the part of the State it renders what we style moral support to the Church; that is, it advances one step beyond what has been styled *legal* support, which is only of necessity.

Now these two forms of support have been rendered from the first founding of our nation down to the present. At the first, as emigration was largely composed of those who left their native lands for some reason connected with the attainment of unmolested worship in accordance with the convictions of their own consciences, there was an earnest and solemn league between State and Church. It was felt that the former could not flourish unless by its side the latter ministered to the wants of its citizens. As the nation grew other elements were incorporated within its complicated organism, until an order of emigration quite different from that of the early fathers was introduced—which delighted in practically setting at defiance the restrictions tacitly and cheerfully adopted before, and which culminated in the Communists, who have chiefly settled in Chicago, and in the worshipers of Gambrinus, whose delight it is to destroy the quiet Sunday for which our country has been noted. Still we find the general spirit of the nation remains substantially what it was in the beginning. The efforts of godless men to overthrow the restraints of religion are met steadily by earnest counter-efforts in its favor, and the American people may be said, as a whole, to be devotedly opposed to the overthrow of the religious customs and usages of their fathers, and willing by law and example to aid in upholding the Church and her work. To this conclusion we do not think we are led by any overstrained optimism, but after a careful comparison of the present condition of the nation with that it presented fifty or one hundred years ago.

3. *Pecuniary Support.* Should the State furnish pecuniary support to the Church by *direct* contributions, or *indirectly* by relieving it from the burden of taxation? Our own answer to this question is an emphatic negative.

Direct pecuniary support of the Church by the State tends to subordinate the former to the latter or creates an effort at combining the two so as to make the Church find its greatest glory in the worldly possessions and temporal power she may attain. The subservient position is not more degrading than the unnatural race for power. The object in both cases is the same, "the meat that perisheth," and not that "which endureth unto everlasting life." It is a recognition of that which is of the earth earthy, and a subordination of higher and eternal interests to those which are fleeting and transitory. The centuries that have elapsed since the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit, have abounded with illustrations of the fact that the Church is in fullest vigor, is strongest when she is not associated with or dependent upon temporal alliances, is most blest with holy men and holy women, and most strikingly executes the task of reclaiming fallen humanity when she is struggling in the waves of temporal adversity. Riches seem to clog her purposes, make her steps unsteady, dim the heavenly light that should sparkle in her eyes, clothe her plain truthful utterances with adornments adopted for reasons of policy, and convert her into a mere grand benevolent politic organization for philanthropic purposes. And so when she relies not upon the liberal spirit that her members should feel stirred up within them, in token of their gratitude and their sense of obligation, but depends for support upon the bounty of the State grudgingly given, she not only suffers in so far as her members are denied the opportunity of learning how blessed a thing it is to give, but she speedily learns to truckle to men in power and to look with leniency upon the sins of those who furnish her support. The power to rebuke sin in high places becomes greatly weakened, and we have the sad illustration of the fact that the organization which should be a perpetual protest against the world, the flesh and the devil, by an unnatural attachment to the first of these, may become exceedingly lenient to the whole three. Heavy endowments are quite as great temptations to sloth in congregations as great wealth is in the individual. The necessity of constant exertion as a duty is speedily lost sight of unless extraordinary efforts are made. And pride takes the place of the meek and lowly spirit which should mark the followers of Him who had not where to lay His head.

Indeed, it is exceedingly difficult for any minister to hold even the position of chaplain by State appointment, whether in army or navy, in reformatory or benevolent institutions, in national or state legislatures, deriving his salary from the public treasury, and not to feel a tendency to favor the political side from whence he has derived his appointment, to think kindly of its shortcomings, to hide its errors, or to give them a saintly veneer, and to hesitate to rebuke the sons of those from whom he derives his food and clothing. Some there be who cannot resist this tendency, and succumb; but there are others who do battle with it daily, and find that an ecclesiastical office in the State-organization is by no means an easy position for him who would do his Master's will.

It may be asserted, however, by those who have accompanied us so far in the discussion, that admitting all this, yet the State should not impose upon the Church the burden of taxation for any personal or real property she may possess, since the very necessity of the case requires her to have a local habitation, and the liberality of her members may place large sums of money at her disposal for benevolent purposes, and since the influence of the Church in repressing crime and in forming virtuous citizens demands that her property should receive special exemption. But is not exemption from taxation the reception of pecuniary support from the State? If my creditor forgives me a debt I owe him, is it not the same as though he had directly given me an equivalent amount? The arguments presented against direct pecuniary contributions are just as valid against indirect contributions in the way of exemption from taxation. The statesman opposes the exemption at present, because he sees a danger to our institutions in the accumulation of wealth in ecclesiastical organizations, which claim the same protection for it that is accorded all other property, without contributing towards the expenses of the government. He sees some of these organizations gradually but steadily increasing the amount of their landed property, which is as rapidly stricken from the basis of taxation as the title is secured, and he begins to doubt whether some of the followers of Him who did not advise His disciples to claim exemption from tribute, but to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, are not unmindful of their obligations to the State—an organization of Divine origin—while they profess intense devotion to the Church. He justly claims that "the exemption of church property from taxation is equivalent to a direct subsidy from the State to the Church, which is a violation of the principle, well recognized in this country, that Church and State should be totally separate."

But the thoughtful Christian is beginning to look upon this exemption also with dissatisfaction. He knows that he has duties toward the State which he cannot shirk, and that he must bear his proportionate part of the burdens that she lays upon her citizens. When he unites with his brethren and erects a house for the worship of God, giving with joy from his own abundance, that it may be as commodious, comfortable and ornamental as the houses that he and his friends occupy, does he not expect that the expense necessary for heating and lighting the same, and for repairing the ravages of time, shall be met by himself and his fellow members or their successors, or does he entertain the hope that all this will be done by the State? Why then should he expect to be relieved from the annual contributions that the same should pay toward the State? If direct assistance be considered something in the way of subsidy, why not this indirect mode of doing the same thing?

In becoming members of the church we surrender none of our rights, and are exempted from none of our obligations as citizens. The Christian should be the best citizen, ready to do his duty to the State, whenever and wherever called upon, willing to aid in obeying her laws and never shrinking from the burdens she feels obliged to impose upon all. One of these burdens is taxation to secure means for her support. And it is his duty to bear this just as much as it is his duty to contribute to the other expenses of public worship, or to see that his minister receives proper support for himself and family.

This subject of indirect subsidy from the State in the way of exemption from taxation is one which now claims attention at the hands of the Church. Is such exemption favorable to "the healthiest Christian influence?"

Art. IV.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF PRAYER.

REV. HENRY CARPENTER (B. A., OXFORD), NEW YORK.

When a great poet lamented that "glory and loveliness have passed away," he spoke a truth which our age confirms now and then by some stern and solemn illustration. The gorgeous haze of romance is melting; the hard philosophy of fact is pushing back the borders of the marvelous, and disenchanting the kingdom of the supernatural and unknown. Henceforth there shall be no more mystery. Nature, which before was a haunted house, is to be a grand international hotel. Science is knocking at every door and entering every chamber with the lamp of analysis in her hand. No theory, no principle, can escape—all is to be tested and tabulated; all reduced to statistical inquiry, and proved by mathematical demonstration. The fiery furnace of criticism is heated sevenfold hotter than before, whilst religion herself is invited to arrest her volatile essence, and bring it down to the earthen crucible of the same analytical chemistry. We are not, therefore, surprised if the spirit of investigation, after traversing the entire circumference of the Christian faith, should now advance to that which is the core and centre of all religion whatever, and that *prayer*, as a spiritual phenomenon, should have recently been made the subject, I cannot say of philosophical, but rather statistical discussion. The national intercession for a dying prince in Great Britain; his restoration from death to life; the unexpected answer; the public amazement; the general thanksgiving, were on a scale too remarkable to escape the notice of scientific observers. Professor Tyndal has accordingly proposed, as a practical test of the efficacy of prayer, that one ward in a hospital should be made the subject of special intercession, and the results carefully registered, and that on this exclusive and arbitrary basis for our inductions, the world should raise its reconstructed theory of prayer. In this paper, I desire to relieve the subject of its theological surroundings, and to forget (if

I can) that I am even a Christian—I speak after the manner of men.

Prayer can be viewed in two ways; in the abstract, or, in its different specific forms of intercession. Considering it as a purely abstract question, we must allow that if God has a personal existence; if He is a moral and intelligent King, not an all-diffusive essence; if worship is to be offered at all, and man is to make any communication to his Maker, there must be what is commonly called prayer. That prayer is innate, not acquired; not the result of early training, but born with man quite as much as conscience, hunger, and the capabilities of pleasure and pain, might be shown from the fact that nothing grows up or establishes itself more spontaneously, nothing requires so small an amount of specific education. It is a universal instinct, not the product of our latitude or of our age, but common to all colors, climates, creeds—to Parsees, Brahmins, Lutherans, Latter-day Saints; to all phases of faith, from the Christians who worship Christ down to the Yzidees who worship the devil. Ὃ πᾶσι δοκεῖ·τούτ εἶναι φάμεν. That which is universally agreed upon, we assume as a fact. Now is this deeply implanted instinct of humanity, as it yearns towards its God, little more than an aimless aspiration, a passionate sigh breathed into the unanswering air, and nothing better than the inarticulate cry of the animal for help? I appeal to what is known as the argument of design, which refers everything that lives to a final cause, and, I ask, does the Creator implant hunger in man without giving him also something to eat? or thirst without something to drink? Does He frame the eye and then leave it to roll on darkness and vacancy, or the ear to listen in vain for the sounds and harmonies of the world? And when I pass to a faculty which is most nearly akin to what is divine, which carries man across the confines of the eternal, and is the immediate outlet for all the stifled passions of the soul, am I to be told that this, the universal practice of all ages, is a mockery, a vague and unprofitable ejaculation, prompted by the Maker himself, who after all is not the Father who pitieth his children, but a blind, remorseless automaton, that sentinels the world?

At the opening of the subject and at every turn of the discussion, we are confronted with the trite and often-repeated objection that to admit that the Deity answers prayer, is to say that He can break through the unvarying and predestinated order of His laws, in order to gratify the pious wishes of an individual. Stay, O man: is the Almighty the master of His own laws, or their slave? But granting all this to the objection, and allowing that the Deity never interferes with the laws of His creation, that these are fixed and unalterable, that sovereign law must ever have her onward way; are there not besides these *material* laws, (of which so much is made,) certain *moral* laws equally fixed, rigid and unalterable, and as far transcending the material economy of Nature, as man is better than the stone or the tree? Prayer is one of the laws of the moral world. Prayer, as far as we know, is not less natural and necessary to spiritual health than established order is to physical life. But prayer and natural order are opposed. Here, then, we enter a region of fact—laws arranged against laws—and because these appear to be inconsistent with one another, are we to attempt a clumsy solution of the difficulty by ignoring altogether one class of laws, for the only reason that *the fact of prayer* seems to be irreconcilable with the fact of invariable order and fixity? It is no argument to say that these two are mutually antagonistic. So are many other great facts, and still they remain facts. So are the two principles of Freedom and Necessity, the props of the moral world. How is the existence of evil compatible with a God who is Purity and Love? How can the orthodox Christian reconcile the fact of an atonement with the fact of an Omnipotence, who could have absolved, if he had chosen, without any atonement? Prayer, therefore, an established law in the *moral* world, cannot be abandoned simply because it seems to come into collision with certain laws in the *material* world.

But is it true that prayer, in the abstract, is at variance with natural law? *My use* of this great instrument of spiritual intercourse with God may often jar with many arrangements of His providence. But the instrument itself, when allowed to follow the designs of its author, seldom crosses the path of any established law. Does any one pray that the sun may stand still, or that the moon may come a little nearer, so that we may get a better view of its surface? If I see a wall in the act of falling on the head of a friend, I do not petition the Almighty to suspend the law of gravitation till my friend can run away. If a child falls into a river, I do not ask that the water may suddenly lose its power to stifle and drown. It is one thing for God to repeal a law; another to alter its application. And thus, it cannot be said that we destroy the immutable character of the Divine Being, because we maintain that He alters the course of events in answer to human supplications. For it should be borne in mind that there is a broad distinction to be drawn between the moral and the physical unchangeableness of God. *Morally*, God can never change: His perfections can never be more or less than they are. *Physically*, He can, and does alter every hour; He makes death and transformation to be the law of life, and writes mutability on the face of the creation. He can reach His appointed goal by adopting another path in answer to a prayer, by introducing some new detail, by omitting some subordinate circumstance, without breaking through the unity of His design. We need not go far for the proofs of His physical unchangeableness,—the elements, the seasons, the skies; then the accidents, fortuities and coincidences of every moment. Once grant me the physical mutability of the Creator, not in His laws, but in their application, and I have a fact, by which, as with the lever of Archimedes, I can hurl back the weightiest objections of my opponent. You allow that God physically can change. Why not, then, for the prayers of His children? I cannot say that He will remove those laws which are the boundaries of existence, but He must have room enough between these to move and operate as He pleases.

It is at least fair to allow to the Deity as much as we allow to man. No one will deny that one man assists in walling up history, and the agency of one individual has given a new direction to the story of our earth. May we not admit that God can have the same influence in his own world, which man has in a world which is not his own. Now when we reflect that in every incident of life, whether in a shower of rain, or the discharge of a pistol, or the drowning of a fly, a certain number of coefficient causes must be present in order to bring about the event, it is not unreasonable to suppose, that, in the production of every result, God may have ordained prayer to be *one* of those coefficient and absolutely indispensable conditions, without which the result could never have been attained. Prayer is thus the last drop which makes the cup of blessing overflow.

At the close of these general reflections, it may not be out of place to glance at a few special aspects of the subject. It is asked, How or in what way does the Deity make answers to prayer? To meet the inquiry in the same negative spirit in which it is made, I would reply by asking if there is any reason why we should not say that the uninterrupted flow of nature's every-day benevolence is not in itself an answer to the prayers of men? Can we affirm with certainty that the unvaried and harmonious order of diurnal and annual goodness would circle around us with the same regularity, if all intercession were to cease? This test should also be applied.

A few practical examples may be selected in conclusion, which may assist us a little in arriving at a theory of prayer.

General intercession for some particular temporal blessing has been made the subject of a sneer. Take one example which we choose at random: the prayer for rain. It was after hearing such a prayer offered in a parish church in England, that a farmer exclaimed, "They need not pray for rain as long as the wind blows from that 'art'" (quarter). This has since become the cant reply: for philosophers have their cant quite as much as the faithful. There is not a grain of sense in the objection. The fall of the rain more or less depends on the course of the wind, the course of the wind depends on certain atmospheric conditions, these again on certain caloric or electric combinations, these in their turn are influenced by higher laws, and these by laws yet higher and further withdrawn; till step after step rising in the ascending scale of causation, the thought is lost in the unexplored abyss, where law wheeled within, carries the mind at length to one central movement, which can in answer to our prayers give the first pulse that travels outward, enlarging the circumference of power, touching one law after another, and bringing down the solicited blessing to the feet of man.

Again, there are instances in which one man's gain would be another man's loss, and in these the selfish prayer of an individual is mercifully rejected for the welfare of the many. In seasons of special intercession this often happens. The following case came recently to my knowledge: The occupants of a rural district in

Ireland, after a long continuance of drought, came to their priest and asked him to use his acknowledged influence to procure from Heaven the much desired shower. The Reverend Father promised them rain, provided they were all unanimous in the wish for it. A parochial meeting was immediately summoned. One rose and expressed his great desire, in common with many more, for rain. Another said that rain would be his ruin ; another wished for it in a week's time ; another for a day's rain, but no more. At last his reverence interposed and dismissed his flock, adding that he could do nothing in the matter till they were all agreed as to what was best. Meanwhile the Almighty had done it for them.

Not unfrequently it happens that the Deity alters the petition as it rises to Him, and returns it to His creatures fulfilled under another form, and in this way substitutes a blessing for what would have been a curse. The memorable instance in the life of St. Monica should not be forgotten, as it is conveyed in the beautiful words of Augustine. She had prayed that her son might not go to Rome and fall a martyr to persecution. In spite of her prayers he went, and there found Christ. "What was it, O my God, that she sought of Thee? But Thou, listening to the *hinge* of her desire," (not to the particular request, but to that on which it turned,) "didst disregard the thing which she then asked, that Thou mightest do in me that which she was ever asking."

By thus transmuting the prayer into a higher form, the Father may be said to answer it. In the year 1871 a striking example of this came under my notice while in Europe. At the end of July and through the greater part of August unusual rains prevailed in England, and even more so in France and Germany. Prayers went up on every side for fair weather, and still the rains descended, and the floods came. If the universal desire for warm and cloudless skies had been granted, and the wonted sunshine had heated the battle-fields of France, that year might have added a black page to European history. Who shall say what pestilence might have gone forth from those charnel-houses of the slain, what thousands the autumn might have garnered for the grave!

The adoption of a prayer-gauge is nothing less than dictation to God on the part of man. The author of such a proposal might as well say, "If the Divine Being will fulfill certain requests, I will believe in Him; if he does not, I wont." To prescribe any test of the kind would be to pervert prayer into a species of sorcery; it would be equivalent to asking the God of Christianity to lay aside His wisdom and authority as a sovereign, to sink to the level of some genius in an eastern tale, whose aid was enlisted by spells and artifices, or to the still lower level of the pagan divinities, which were ridiculed, bantered, satirized and whipped, if they did not comply with the wishes of their worshipers.

Nor is it any solution of the difficulty to maintain, that the only answer to prayer is the discovery and development of certain moral resources within ourselves, and that the result is purely subjective, without producing any objective consequences whatever. This would withdraw from the majority of men the chief incentive to prayer. A man prays because he feels a want, and expects to obtain something from God.

Lastly, in spite of all that can be said, men *will* pray. The reason may plead, but the heart is an irresistible orator. Prayer still remains an unargued and ineradicable instinct in man. Else, why has the world rolled through six, ay, it may be sixty millenniums from its dateless birth, and men have never ceased to pray; the chill of silence has not settled with its death-cold on the lips of human supplication; temples rise, litanies resound, intercessions ascend, and mightier than these more elaborated and artificial expressions of worship, the heart of man cries unceasingly to the God after whom it yearns. The sceptical may reason it down, the scoffing may laugh it away for awhile; but as long as men believe that there is a Being to whom they can say "Our Father," as long as they are the creatures of passion and hope, of agony and aspiration, they will turn in their hours of darkness toward the Unseen and Everlasting, assuredly believing that they approach a God who hears and also answers their prayer.

HENRY CARPENTER.

ART V.—APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

BY REV. CALVIN S. GERHARD, A. M., SUNBURY, PA.

THE Christian Church is unique in its character. It differs fundamentally from all other organizations in the world. Societies and civil governments may illustrate its nature, but furnish at best but very faint analogies of its constitution. The Church differs essentially from them all. In what does this fundamental diversity consist? Not in the fact that the design of the Church is different from that of all other organizations. The design of temperance societies is to reform drunkards and check the spread of intemperance; of beneficial societies, to render assistance to their members in time of need; of national governments, to protect and promote the civil interests of their citizens; of the Church, to save sinners and make them meet for an inheritance with the saints in light. There is in this respect a vast difference between the Church and other institutions, but the difference is not fundamental. Neither is it to be found in the fact that the Church was ordained directly of God. True, it was established by God more directly than any other institution; but the powers that be, that is, civil governments, are also ordained of God, as St. Paul tells us.

Not in these characteristics does the fundamental difference between the Church and all other organizations come to view, but in the fact that the Christian Church is the organic embodiment of Christianity, an order of life found nowhere else in the world. For Christianity, in its deepest ground, is not an influence simply, exerted on humanity by Christ through the Holy Ghost, neither is it a system of supernatural powers only, nor the true religion merely, but an order of life, flowing directly from the person of Jesus Christ, and actualizing itself in the Christian Church, which is His Body (Eph i. 23). For as the wages of sin is *death*, so the gift of God is *eternal life, through Jesus Christ, our Lord* (Rom. vi. 23). Hence the Saviour says of Himself: "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life; the Resurection and the Life." In Him was life—uncreated, immortal, eternal life—for the *Word* was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth. The Word, who hath life in Himself (John v. 26), became flesh, and flesh—humanity in its generic character—in His Person was made alive, became immortal. Hence as in Adam, all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive (1 Cor. xv. 22). For He has abolished death and brought life and immortality to light. By the mystery of His holy Incarnation; by His holy nativity and circumcision; by His baptism, fasting and temptation; by His agony and bloody sweat; by His cross and passion; by His precious death and burial; by His glorious resurrection and ascension, and by the coming of the Holy Ghost, He conquered Satan, broke the power of sin, overcame the sharpness of death, unlocked the prison doors of Hades, poured a flood of light upon the darkness of the grave, and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers.

The Christian Church, which is the kingdom of heaven actualizing itself among men, therefore starts in His person, and as His Mystical Body constitutes the form of His presence in the world, by the Holy Ghost, since His death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven. During His earthly sojourn, He was locally present on earth in His natural human body, and as His Divine-human life was then confined to His natural body, through which He manifested forth His glory, so now is His glorified Divine-human life, which is mystically present in the world, through the Holy Ghost since the day of Pentecost, confined on earth to His Mystical Body, the Church. For He is Head over all things to the Church, which is His Body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all; and we are members of His Body, of His flesh, and of His bones, (Eph. i. 22, 23, and v. 30). As the Incarnate Son of God, He is distinct from and above His Mystical Body, and possesses a personal human body, with members like those of our own bodies, only that since His resurrection and ascension into Heaven it is positively perfect and wholly glorified; but at the same time also, as the Saviour of the world, He is present through the Holy Ghost with living energy in the Church, which constitutes His Mystical Body, and through which He begets and nourishes new centres of spiritual life, like unto His own, whereby men become partakers of the Divine nature (2 Peter i. 4), and in having the Church as their mother, have God as their Father.

Christianity is, therefore, truly organic, and as such can no more exist in the world apart from an objective outward constitution, than any other order of life can. Just as vegetable life, though broader and deeper than its manifestations and not identical with them, actualizes itself only in living plants, so does Christianity come before us as a concrete reality only in the Christian Church. Its influence, it is true, extends far beyond the Church in the way of elevating and civilizing mankind; but so also does the influence of vegetable life extend beyond the limits of a tree in the cooling shade which this last casts upon the dry and parched earth, during the burning heat of a mid-summer day. But as vegetable life glorifies the earth actually only in the degree in which its mineral properties are assimilated by plants, and thus converted from dead inorganic matter into living vegetable bodies, so does Christianity, as an order of life, enter into living union with men only when they are born again of water and the Spirit, and thus made members of that objective constitution, the Christian Church, in which alone Christ is present on earth with saving grace. "This constitution, or order of grace, is what our *faith* is taught to receive in the article of the Holy Catholic Church; that great mystery which is denominated Christ's Body, and within which is comprised, according to the Creed, the whole supernatural process of man's salvation, from baptism for the remission of sins, onward to the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting. It is not of the first creation, like the art and science and political institutions of mankind in every other view. It holds directly from Christ in His capacity of glorified superiority to the universal order of nature. He is Head *over all things* to the Church."

In a threefold form this headship of our Lord reveals itself in His Church. He is its Chief Prophet, High Priest and Eternal King. As Chief Prophet He is in Himself the principle and fountain of all knowledge, for in Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Col. ii. 3). As High Priest He is the Mediator, through whom living union and communion have been established and are maintained between God and man. As Eternal

King He has all power in heaven and on earth, and governs, by His word and Spirit, those who are incorporated into the order of grace of which His Church is the organic embodiment. All this He is actually for men since the day of Pentecost, when He was mystically born into the world, through the Holy Ghost, by entering into life union with the one hundred and twenty susceptible persons whom He had gathered unto Himself, during His earthly sojourn, out of the Jewish Church, a dispensation of grace typical of, and preparatory to, the Christian Church. On that day the disciples received the *Promise of the Father* (Luke xxiv. 49)—the Spirit as immanent now in human nature itself through the glorification of Christ—the Holy Ghost (John vii. 39). *He* came as the medium through whom Jesus Christ constituted Himself the Head of the Mystical Body, which He then formed for Himself out of the disciples assembled in the upper room in Jerusalem. Then and there the Christian Church was born. And "as a babe, when born, possesses all the organs of a complete human body, so did the Church on the Day of Pentecost come into existence as a complete spiritual organism," possessing in Christ through the Holy Ghost, the power of self-preservation and growth. "No essential part, or power, or function of this new creation was wanting." There was at once a laity, endowed with the life and character of true Church membership; and a ministry empowered to preach, to administer the sacraments, and to organize into a community and govern in the spirit of love those over whom the Holy Ghost had made them overseers; and all alike possessed new spiritual life in Christ through the Holy Ghost.

In one respect there was no difference between the Apostles and the other disciples, between the first ministry and the first laity. Each individual had received the Holy Ghost and possessed the same exalted privilege of communion with Christ, and therefore of direct access to the throne of grace. Laity and ministry had an equal right to the benefits of the Holy Eucharist, as well as to all other blessings which flow from Christ to persons in living union with Him in His Church. All alike were members of Christ by faith, and thus partakers of His anointing. As he had been anointed with the Holy Ghost, as Prophet, Priest and King, so His Mystical Body, as a whole, was a prophetical, sacerdotal and kingly community. The laity, as well as the ministry, were prophets, priests and kings unto God (Rev. i. 6). Nevertheless, as office-bearers in virtue of the commission given to the eleven (Matt, xxviii. 16), before our Lord's ascension, the Apostles received special gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 4; and Eph. iv. 11–16) whereby they were empowered to act as the Saviour's ambassadors (2 Cor v. 20). As Christian men, they possessed what the other disciples possessed; as officers in the Church of Christ, they were invested with special duties, authority and power. Before His ascension our Lord had said to them: "All power is given unto me in heaven, and in earth; go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 18–20). This commission the Apostles began to exercise on the day of Pentecost, when they were endued with power from on high (Luke xxiv. 49), that is, were actually clothed by Christ, through the Holy Ghost, with the spiritual powers and authority involved in their commission. According to the terms of this commission the Apostles were to stand between Christ and the world lying in wickedness and sin, "to be His witnesses, His legates, the representatives of His authority, and the mediators of His grace among men." The gospel they were to preach in His Name was not simply a doctrine for the nations to hear and believe, but *Himself* present with saving grace in an objective visible constitution, to which individuals in order to be saved were obliged to surrender themselves in penitence and faith; Holy Baptism forming the sacramental means of every true entrance into this supernatural economy of grace. Thus the Christian Church, when fully established, confronted the world as an organized community, growing forth from Jesus Christ, through the Holy Ghost, and held together by the men who had been authorized and empowered to carry into effect officially its conditions and terms. Hence it is said to be built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone (Eph. ii. 20).

The office of the ministry being of such central significance in the establishment of the Christian Church, it must hold essentially the same position always, and thus constitute the organ through which the Church is perpetuated from one generation to another. This fact involves "the idea of Apostolic succession, and along with it the conception also of ordination, as the veritable channel through which is transmitted mystically from age to age the supernatural authority in which this succession consists. And the succession, to be valid, must be kept up in some way within the bosom of the institution itself; for it holds not from the natural life of the world, nor even from the higher life of the Church collectively taken, but directly from the commission and ordination of Christ, and so can be maintained with its original character from age to age, only as it may have power to transmit the actual virtue of this first supernatural appointment from one generation still onward to another."*

The question of Apostolic succession is, therefore, not an idle one, but a question which challenges our most serious and careful consideration. In it are involved consequences of profound and far reaching significance for all who profess and call themselves Christians; since, as we have seen, he alone can be a true minister of our Lord, invested with authority by Christ Himself, to go forth in His name as His ambassador, representing Him in His Church, founded on the day of Pentecost, who has received his authority from Jesus Christ, through His Apostles, at the hands of their successors. Unquestionably, according to the plain terms of the Apostolic commission, and according to the necessary nature of the Christian Church, as built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, only he can properly claim to be commissioned by Christ, who performs his ministerial acts by the authority and as the exponent of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which our Saviour founded upon a rock, against which the gates of Hades shall never prevail, and which is thus necessarily the one true Church.

Such being the truth of God, in advocating it we are not responsible for the consequences which it may involve, but it is our duty to divest it of the false inferences which are frequently drawn from it, when thus definitely stated. We *deny*, therefore, what is often asserted, that this Catholic doctrine of Apostolic succession virtually makes ordination the chief sacrament,* and necessarily implies that the minister is of the essence of a sacrament, that is: that Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist cannot be validly administered under any circumstances whatever, except by regularly ordained ministers. Evidently the Apostles alone were commissioned to baptize; for the commission was not given to all the disciples, but to the eleven (Matt. xxviii. 16, 19), and yet we find that Ananias, who was only a disciple, a layman (Acts ix. 10), baptized the Apostle Paul. This case was in all respects extraordinary, and thus clearly an exception, but as an exception nevertheless confirms the early decisions of the undivided Catholic Church, in admitting the validity of lay baptism in extreme and urgent cases—*in periculo mortis.* And if one of the sacraments can be validly administered by a layman, there is no logic, no consistent Christian reasoning, and no Scriptural evidence to support the theory maintained by Roman Catholics and High Church Episcopalians, that the consecration of the elements in the Holy Eucharist is conditioned by the Episcopal ordination of the officiating clergyman. Therefore that the validity of a sacrament depends on the word and institution of Christ, and not on the official position of the celebrant, is a Protestant principle more truly Catholic than the position of Romanists and High Church Episcopalians. Of course to be *regularly*, as well as validly administered, the persons who have been set apart by Christ Himself for the purpose, must administer the sacraments; but in necessitous circumstances, which can arise only in the case of baptism, the Church Catholic holds that this sacrament can be irregularly but validly administered by laymen, *not*, however, *in defiance or contempt* of the ministry, but only in case of their unavoidable absence. And, moreover, such irregular acts, to be properly completed, need to be ratified and confirmed by the Church, whereby they receive the official sanction of those whom Jesus Christ has appointed as the stewards of the mysteries of grace.

---

*Sermon by Dr. J. W. Nevin, on "The Christian Ministry," MERCERSBURG REVIEW, January No., 1855.

But to return from this digression. Both from its origin and from its design, which have both been already considered, it is plain that the office in question must be a single institution, in harmony with itself in all its parts. The commission given to the Apostles, belonged to them only in their collective capacity. And so, as the ministry assumed other forms, whether ordinary or extraordinary, it remained necessarily subject always to the power of the same law. Just as among the Jews the Priesthood was one, though the priests were many and of different orders; so in the Christian Church, however ministers are multiplied, and the forms of their office varied, the office itself can be of force only as it retains always the character of a single body, bound together and in union with itself.*

---

*Vide Martiensen's Dogmatics, Sect. 272, in which this eminent theologian strangely confounds the false claims of the Roman Church with the truth of Apostolic succession.

The Church of Rome lays great stress on this truth, but has pushed it to such an extreme as to totally obscure its real nature. It involves much more than such an external, despotic, arbitrary union as that which the Roman Church endeavors to secure, at the expense of the Scriptures and Church History, by claiming for the Pope, as the vicegerent of Jesus Christ, and successor of Saint Peter, upon whom Jesus Christ founded His Church, personal infallibility and absolute jurisdiction over the whole Christian Church. We will proceed now to examine the exclusive claims of this Church, as well as those of the Episcopal Church, which regards itself as *the Church par excellence*, and will prove conclusively that the great Protestant non-Episcopal Reformation Churches of Germany, as well as all other Protestant bodies that have received and preserved the succession of their ministry through Presbyters, must be acknowledged to possess a ministry as truly valid as that of the Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches; and that in spite of the lamentable divisions of Christendom, the bond of union has not been wholly severed, but that the different Churches are still essentially one.

In endeavoring to establish the Papal theory of the Church—which claims that no ministry is valid except that which derives its authority from, and is outwardly bound to, the visible centre of the Church, the Pope, through various hierarchical degrees—its advocates appeal to the Holy Scriptures and Tradition. The passages of Scripture quoted are the following: "And the Lord said, Simon,

---

* Vide Dr. Nevin's sermon on "The Christian Ministry."

Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren;" (Luke xxii. 31, 32); "And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;" (Matt. xvi. 18, 19); and, "So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter; Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, 'Feed my lambs.' He saith to him again the second time," etc. (John xxi. 15–18).

"We admit at the outset," says Dr. Schaff in his history of the Vatican Council, "that these passages in their obvious meaning, which is confirmed by the history of the Apostolic Church, assign to Peter a certain primacy among the Apostles; he was the leader and spokesman of them, and the chief agent of Christ in laying the foundation of His Church among the Jews and Gentiles. This is significantly prophesied in the new name of Peter given to him. The history of Pentecost (Acts ii.) and the conversion of Cornelius (Acts x.) are the fulfillment of this prophecy, and furnish the key to the interpretation of the passages in the gospels."

This is the scriptural truth of St. Peter's primacy in the Apostolic Church, which is, however, very different from that which the Pope occupies in reference to the Roman Catholic Church. Peter stands pre-eminent among the Apostles, not by special Divine appointment, but because he possessed the natural endowments and mental peculiarities of a leader. These, under the quickening power of the Spirit, made him the most prominent member of the Apostolic college. His impetuous, ardent temperament continually reveals itself and makes him conspicuous, both as a sinner and a saint. He was the first to give expression to the evangelic faith of the disciples, but he also denied his Lord. Of superiority in rank and official power on the part of Peter over the other Apostles there is no evidence in the New Testament, which is its own best interpreter. Not a single example of the exercise of such jurisdiction on the part of Peter is to be found, but we do find the very reverse. "He himself, in his epistles, disowns and prophetically warns his fellow-Presbyters against the hierarchical spirit; exhorting them instead of being lords over God's heritage, to be examples to His flock (1 Peter v. 1–4). Paul and John were perfectly independent of him, as the Acts and epistles prove. Paul even openly administered to him a rebuke at Antioch. At the Council of Jerusalem James seems to have presided; at all events, he proposed the compromise which was adopted by the Apostles, elders and brethren. And moreover, to make the above passages of Scripture at all available for its purpose, the Papacy must take for granted, as intervening links of the argument, that which cannot be proved by the New Testament, nor from history, viz: that Peter was Bishop of Rome; that he was there as Paul's superior; that he appointed a successor, and transferred to him his prerogatives."*

Ideas rule the world, and logic is very often the real power behind the throne. It was not the Scriptural account of St. Peter's position among the Apostles that suggested the Papal theory of the Church; but the theological conception of the nature of Church unity, as held by the Fathers even in the third and fourth centuries, sought to maintain and unfold itself during the Middle Ages by reading its own ideas into the Scriptures. This theory of the unity of the Church, which comes to view already in Ignatius, and is more fully developed by Cyprian and Augustine, involved more than its authors were aware of. Carried out to its full logical conclusion, it has culminated in the Vatican decree of Papal absolutism and infallibility. These Fathers had hold of a profound truth, and a profound truth underlies "the colossal lie" of the Papacy. Every powerful error rests on some truth, which it has perverted and from which it derives all its strength. The Church *is one and catholic*, as well as holy and Apostolic. In Christ she possesses all these attributes, but not one of them has ever been fully actualized on earth. Just as the historical Church has never been perfectly holy, so neither has she ever fully actualized the attribute of catholicity, which, whilst it can express itself only through actual concrete forms of Christian life, according to the laws of history and humanity related on the one hand to Adam, and on the other to Christ, cannot, however, find full actual embodiment for itself *in any particular age or form of the Church.* The outward, empirical, historical Church, will fully actualize the holy Catholic Church, in which we are taught to believe, only when, having passed through her militant state on earth, her Lord shall come and lead her in triumph, as a bride adorned for her husband, through the everlasting doors into the mansions of glory.

---

*Dr. Schaff's History of the Vatican Council.

As the Scriptures know nothing of a visible, absolute, infallible centre of unity in the Church, so neither do genuine tradition and the history of the early Church. The first documents which endeavor to support this conception of Church unity are "the pseudo-Isidoran Decretals, that huge forgery of Papal letters which appeared in the middle of the ninth century, and had for heir object the completion of the independence of the Episcopal hierarchy from the State, and the absolute power of the Popes as the legislators and judges of all Christendom. Here the most extravagant claims are put into the mouths of the early Popes, from Clement (91) to Damasus (384), in the barbarous French-Latin of the Middle Ages, and with such numerous and glaring anachronisms as to force the conviction of fraud even upon Roman Catholic scholars. One of these sayings is: 'The Roman Church remains to the end free from stain of heresy!' Soon afterwards arose, in the same hierarchical interest, the legend of the donation of Constantine and his baptism by Pope Sylvester, interpolations of the writings of the Fathers, especially Cyprian and Augustine, and a variety of fictions embodied in the *Gesta Liberii* and the *Liber Pontificalis*, and sanctioned by Gratianus (about 1150) in his *Decretum*, or collection of canons, which (as the first part of the *corpus juris canonici*) became the code of laws for the whole Western Church, and exerted an extraordinary influence. By this series of pious frauds the mediæval Papacy, *which was the growth of ages*, was represented to the faith of the Church as a primitive institution of Christ, clothed with absolute and perpetual auhority."

"The Popes since Nicholas I. (858-867), who exceeded all his predecessors in the boldness of his designs, freely used what the spirit of a hierarchical, superstitious, and uncritical age furnished them. They quoted the fictitious letters of their predecessors as genuine, the Sardican canon on appeals as a canon of Nicæa, and the interpolated sixth canon of Nicæa, 'the Roman Church always had the primacy,' of which there is not a syllable in the original; and nobody doubted them. Papal absolutism was in full vigor from Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII. Scholastic divines, even Thomas Aquinas, deceived by these literary forgeries, began to defend Papal absolutism over the whole Church, and the councils of Lyons (1274) and of Florence (1439) sanctioned it, although the Greeks soon afterward rejected the false union based upon such assumption."*

But for a radical Ultramontane Roman Catholic, facts which are stubborn things for other men pass for nothing. "If facts disagree with his dogmas, all the worse for the facts. All you have to do is to ignore or to deny them, or to force them, by unnatural interpretations, into reluctant obedience to the dogmas." For instance, Cardinal Manning, as quoted by Dr. Schaff, speaks of history (Petri. Privil. III. p. 18), as "a wilderness without guide or path," and says: "Whensoever any doctrine is contained in the divine revelation of the Church, all difficulties from human history are excluded, as Tertullian lays down, by prescription. The only source of revealed truth is God; the only channel of His revelation is the Church. No human history can declare what is contained in that revelation. The Church alone can determine its limits, and therefore its contents."

All the forgeries of the middle ages have therefore become infallible truths, since the Church has sanctioned them. The end must indeed here *sanctify the means*. Verily, they need sanctification. Is not God in History as well as in the Church? Can one fact contradict another fact? Do not all truths mutually explain each other? The One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, against which the gates of Hades shall never prevail, does not rest on forgeries and falsehoods. She is the ground and pillar of the truth

---

*For a detailed account of the above facts, thus briefly enumerated by Dr. Schaff, in his History of the Vatican Council, see "The Pope and the Council," by Janus: Roberts Brothers, 1870. Authorized translation from the German.

Evidently the exclusive claims of the Roman Church rest on a rotten foundation.

We pass on to consider the claims of Episcopalianism. According to this theory, in the time of the Apostles the Ministry of the Church consisted of *three orders;* Apostles, Bishops or Elders, and Deacons. These three orders are of Divine appointment, and therefore must be continued in the precise form in which they were instituted, through every age of the Church. Each order exists by Divine right, but the succession is limited to the highest order. Apostolic succession is therefore confined to the Episcopate, which has taken the place of the Apostolate. Accordingly, no ministry is valid except that which derives its succession through the Episcopate, represented in every ordination by one or more Bishops. It is admitted that in the time of the Apostles, as is evident from the New Testament, the names Bishop and Presbyter were used interchangeably and applied indiscriminately to the same order of ministers, to those now called Presbyters or Pastors, but out of respect to the original Apostles appointed immediately by our Lord, their successors, who at first were also called Apostles, soon after the Apostolic age, " deeming it not befitting to retain that name for common usage, agreed with the ministers of the second order, that the former should thenceforward be known exclusively as Bishops, and the latter only as Presbyters or Elders."* This fact, it is claimed, is substantiated by Theodoret and St. Ambrose†. But their testimony does not prove that there are three *orders* in the ministry *de jure divino* ; and, moreover, if taken in the Episcopalian sense, is in direct conflict with that of St. Clement, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and other Fathers, as well as with the Reformers of the Church of England themselves, as will be shown hereafter.

The error which lies at the root of the Anglican theory, is that this theory conceives of the Church more as a mechanism than as an organism. Its advocates fail to realize that the Church is our Lord's Body (Col. i. 24), and, therefore, the organic embodiment of His life, mystically present in the world through the Holy Ghost;

---

* Rev. H. L. Ziegenfuss, on " What Constitutes a lawful Ministry?" "Agreed with the ministers of the second *order!*" A plausible way of putting it, and a good specimen of *petitio principii.*

† For the quotations commonly adduced from these Fathers, see pages 426-7.

but regard it rather as a Divine establishment, upheld by certain laws and forms inexorably fixed for all time. Hence the ministry, according to their view, is not an organic function of the Body Mystical, but an institution externally related to the Church, and composed of three sharply-defined orders; the powers of each order being definitely determined by stringent laws that can under no circumstances be relaxed.

This conception is altogether too external. The Church is not a mechanism, but an organism that varies its form as its life, through the opposition which it ever meets with from the world, is gradually with great difficulty unfolded. The Church, therefore, has a history. It confronts us as a living institution, whose form does not create its life, but whose life is continued with its original power under different forms. And what is true of the Church as a whole in this respect, is true also of her ministry. There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one Spirit, one Body, and one ministry. "Wherefore He saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. And He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; from whom the whole Body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love" (Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12, 13, 16).

Does the Apostle mean to assert, in the first part of this quotation, that our Saviour instituted four, or perhaps five, orders in the Ministry—Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers? And how many orders does he speak of in 1. Cor. xii. 28, where he says: "And God has set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues?" Must we add Presbyters and Deacons, or are these "orders" here described by other names? These passages of Scripture, as well as others of similar import, in which the doctrine of the ministry is most fully set forth by the Apostle, are in a great measure ignored by Episcopalians, and have always puzzled them, and all other earnest men who have studied the Apostle's language with the honest purpose of discovering which one of the existing forms of Church government is in accordance with that instituted in the beginning by Divine appointment. The difficulty, however, does not arise from the teaching of the Apostle. It only comes to view when we assume that fixed and definite orders of the ministry and forms of government were given in the beginning by Divine appointment, to be of force for all time. But "it is obvious that when the Redeemer established His Church on earth He did not immediately endow it with a full and complete apparatus of officers, orders and forms of government. On the contrary, He bestowed on it only a single office—one that was exceedingly simple in its character, and yet indispensable—when He appointed the Apostles His witnesses. He designed that other and fuller forms should be developed from within, by the self-determination of the Church, and in correspondence to the exigencies of the times; and the primitive office, the Apostolate, was so constituted as to expand like a tree, sending forth successively, as branches, other forms of the same office, adapted to new times and circumstances."* The office of the ministry is accordingly a single institution, deriving its authority and power always from the commission given to the eleven. The Deacons and Presbyters, or Bishops, ordained by the Apostles, had part in their ministry, and when the Apostolate itself passed away, its ordinary powers and authority were continued under other forms. The ministry itself is an essential factor in the constitution of the Church, but its forms vary according to circumstances, only those which are most simple and fundamental being common to every age of the Church.

In the beginning the Apostles went forth as missionaries, preaching the Word, administering the sacraments, and attending to all the duties which grew out of their position. Soon afterwards Deacons were ordained (Acts vi.), evidently not, however, according to the whole tenor of the narrative, because the Lord Jesus had commanded the Apostles so to do, but because circumstances required it. The particular circumstances under which the first Bishops or Presbyters were appointed are not given, but we find that so soon as the converts of the Apostles were organized into congregations, certain officers were ordained to take charge of them, and were called sometimes Bishops (ἐπισκοποι) (Acts xx. 28; Tit. i. 7; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1); and sometimes Elders (πρεσβυτεροι), (Acts xi. 30; xiv. 23; xv. 2, 4; xxi. 18; 1 Peter v. 1; James v. 14, etc.), the former name describing their position as overseers in the church, and the latter being a title of honor. These officers were ordained by the Apostles with the concurrence of the churches (Acts xiv. 23; Tit. i. 5). Their duties were to oversee, to administer order and exercise discipline, to watch over pure doctrine, and to teach. The Apostles continued, however, as long as they lived, to wield the supreme direction of the churches, but not because they looked upon themselves as an order of the ministry distinct from and superior to that of Bishops or Elders. They ruled then as now, through the inspired Word, of which they were the infallible organs. Instead of jealously guarding their superiority in rank as by divine right, they put themselves on a level with the Presbyters. St. Peter calls himself a *fellow elder* (συμπρεσβύτερος) (1 Peter v. 1), when addressing the Elders in his first epistle. And the only official title with which St. John speaks of himself is that of Elder (πρεσβυπερος). His second epistle commences, "*The Elder* unto the elect lady," and the third, "*The Elder* unto the well beloved Gaius." The distinctive functions of the Apostles were, for the most part, extraordinary, and therefore not transmissible. In their ordinary powers and rights, which alone were capable of transmission, they were simply equal to Presbyters, and, of course then, Presbyters or Elders in these respects equal to them (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Peter v. 1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1.) The first successors of the Apostles were, therefore, Presbyters, and not an order of officers superior to them by Divine right. And no subsequent elevation of Bishops as a distinct class of ministers, no ecclesiastical regulations, and no long-continued Church usage can take away from Presbyters, as official organs of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, their inherent power to transmit, through prayer and the laying on of hands, a valid succession of the Apostolic and Divinely-commissioned Ministry of Jesus Christ.

---

*Lange's Commentary, Acts, p 106.

Neither can the cases of Timothy and Titus be cited as making against this conclusion. These men were not Diocesan or Metropolitan Bishops by Divine right, but Presbyters, whose vocation was extraordinary, and who acted in the capacity of evangelists, or apostolic legates. As to the question of ordination, we find that St. Timothy was ordained by a body of Presbyters, of whom St. Paul was one (1 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. i. 6). That he was not stationed at Ephesus, as a Diocesan bishop, when St. Paul wrote his Epistles to him, is evident from 1 Tim. i. 3, and 2 Tim. iv. 9. (For further information in regard to St. Timothy's position in the Apostolic Church see 1. Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10; Rom. xvi. 21; Col. i. 1; Heb. xiii. 23, etc.). That Titus, also, was not the Diocesan bishop of Crete, appears from Tit. i. 5, and iii. 12.

There are, indeed, different grades in the ministry, but not different orders in the Anglican sense. The presbyterate is central and fundamental. Out of it other forms of office were in the beginning, and still are developed as circumstances require, some higher and some lower than the presbyterate, in its commonly accepted sense. But these do not constitute different orders in the sense that they are all separately of Divine appointment, and must therefore, necessarily be continued. That the Fathers knew nothing of three different *orders* in the ministry, in the Anglican sense, is unwittingly shown by Bingham in his Antiquities of the Christian Church, in trying to make out that they did.* After begging the question of the Divine right of Diocesan Bishops, by asserting that "the most ancient distinction that occurs, is that of the superior clergy into three distinct *orders*,"* he proceeds to show that the ancients used the words *ordo, gradus, officium*, interchangeably; which is the very thing our Anglican brethren refuse to do, because, as they claim, the Episcopate is not a grade, but an order of the ministry.

---

* This eminent author, with all his learning and acuteness, sometimes resorts to strange expedients to make out his points. In reference to the succession of Bishops in the Church of Rome, he says: "It is true, there is a little difference in the account which these authors give of the succession; for some reckon Linus first, then Anacletus, then Clement; others begin with Clement, and reckon him the first in order from St. Peter. But this is easily reconciled by learned men, who make it appear that Linus and Anacletus died whilst St. Peter lived, and that Clement was ordained their successor by St. Peter also. So that we have two or three persons, by this account, ordained successively Bishops of Rome by the hands of the Apostles." (Antiquities of the Christian Church, Book II., chapter i., section 4.) Dr. John Dick, who, although a *Presbyterian*, was, I suppose, a learned man, says: "It happens, unfortunately for the high claims of the Church of Rome, that it is not easy to tell who came in the room of Peter, who, they pretend, was the first Bishop. Clement, Clitus, Linus, and Anacletus, have been mentioned; but it is doubted whether Clitus and Anacletus were not the same individual, and in what order the persons now named succeeded each other while some have suspected that they are all contemporary, and equally Bishops of Rome, as there were several Bishops at the same time in Philippi." (Dick's Theology, Volume ii., Lecture 98.)

We freely admit that at the close of the apostolic age, after the destruction of Jeruselem, probably with the advice of St. John and other apostles still living, the Episcopal form of Church government was gradually introduced, having for its object the unity of the Church in the new critical stage of history upon which it was then entering. But that the Bishops appointed to govern a number of churches together constituting a diocese, were not regarded as an "order" of the ministry superior to Presbyters by divine right, is clear from the epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, "the only indubitably genuine work of any uninspired Christian writer of the first century, who in express terms identifies Bishops and Presbyters; represents the office of Presbyter as highest in the Church, and the Presbyters as the direct and sole successors of the Apostles; divides the officials of the Church into Bishops and Deacons, and speaks of a number of Bishops in one congregation."† There fore we conclude that "the original New Testament apostolic idea of the Episcopate was that of the common rule of pastors in the congregation, and that the Episcopate, as distinct in any sense from the Presbyterate, or of the Presbyterate as in any sense (for example that of ruling eldership) distinct from the Episcopate, is not of Divine right or apostolic institution."‡ This fact is confirmed by Jerome, the most learned of all the Latin Fathers, who says: "Among the ancients, Presbyters and Bishops were the very same; but by little and little, for plucking up plants of dissension, the whole care was devolved upon one. As the Presbyters therefore know, that they are subjected to him who is set over them by the custom of the Church; so let the Bishops know, that they are superior to the Presbyters rather by custom than by any real appointment of Christ."* The great St. Augustine also says: "The office of Bishop is above the office of Priests, not by authority of the Scriptures, but after the names of honor which the custom of the Church hath now obtained."†

---

* Antiquities, Volume I., Liber ii., section 1.

† Dr. C. P. Krauth, on "The Doctrine of the Ministry."

‡ Idem.

In reference to the leading men of the English reformation, such as Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Jewell, Archbishop Whitgift, Archbishop Grindal, Bishop Cooper, and others, Keble says: "It is enough, with them, to show that the government by Bishops and Archbishops is ancient and allowable; they never venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the holy sacraments."‡

Cranmer declares that "the Bishops and Priests were at one time the same, and were no two things, but both one office, in the beginning of the Christian religion."§

Hooker paraphrases the testimony of Jerome, already cited, and expresses his acquiescence in it.||

Of the pre-eminence of Bishops by Divine right, Archdeacon Mason says: "If by *jure divino* you understand a law and commandment of God, binding all Christian Churches, universally, perpetually, unchangeably, and with such absolute necessity that no other form of regiment may in any case be admitted; in this sense neither may we grant it, nor yet can you prove it to be *jure divino*."¶

In the light of what has now been said, the meaning of the following passages from Theodoret and St. Ambrose, before alluded to, and of which Bingham makes so much account, becomes intelligible. Theodoret says: "The same persons were anciently called promiscuously both Bishops and Presbyters, whilst those who are now called Bishops were called Apostles. But shortly after, the name of Apostles was appropriated to such only as were Apostles indeed; and then the name Bishop was given to those who before were called Apostles."** St. Ambrose speaks as follows: "They who are

---

*Comment. in Tit. i. 5, Opp. Ton. vol. 6, p. 168; edit. Victorii, Paris, 1623.

†Quoted by Bishop Jewell. [Defence of his Apol. p. 123.]

‡Preface to Hooker's Polity, xxx.

§Burnet's Reform., App. Bk. 3.

||Eccles. Polity, Bk. 7, Ch. 5.

¶Appendix to his *Vindiciæ.* The above quotations are taken from Dr. Seiss's *Ecclesia Lutherana*

**Bingham's Eccles. Antiq., Bk. 2, Ch. 2, Sect. 1.

now called Bishops were originally called Apostles. But the Holy Apostles being dead, they who were ordained after them to govern the Churches could not arrive at the excellency of those first; nor had they the testimony of miracles, but were in many other respects inferior to them; therefore they thought it not decent to assume to themselves the name of Apostles; but, dividing the names, they left to Presbyters the name of the presbytery, and they themselves were called Bishops."* There is no intimation in these passages that the men appointed to govern the Churches constituted a class of officers superior to Presbyters by Divine right; but these authors simply mean that the Bishop, who exercised the office of President or Superintendent over his fellow-Bishops, or, in other words, occupied the position of *primus inter pares*, when it was found necessary with the growth of the Church in different places to bind together its congregations through some form of government, was at first known by the name of Apostle, and afterwards by common consent took the title of Bishop, leaving to the Bishops under his care the name of Presbyter. Unless taken in this way, the testimony of these men flatly contradicts that of the other Fathers of the Church.

Of the oft-quoted testimony of St. Ignatius, upon which great stress is laid by modern Anglicans, but which is always uncertain, on account of the gross corruptions and interpolations with which his epistles abound, Bishop Stillingfleet says: "In all those thirty-five testimonies produced out of Ignatius' epistles for Episcopacy, I can meet with but one which is brought to prove the least semblance *of an institution of Christ* for Episcopacy; and if I be not deceived, the sense of that place is clearly mistaken, too."†

It is not necessary that we examine all the Church Fathers in detail. When critically reviewed by the impartial student, it is found, as Dr. Krauth says, that their testimony in favor of Diocesan Episcopacy by Divine right, can be cited only when their writings are artificially and violently interpreted, "by confounding different kinds of Episcopacy and of Bishops; by grouping as a unit Christian antiquity at very different stages; by regressive constructions in which a later antiquity is read back into an earlier one; by making far more of the evidence which seems favorable to it, than the evidence can fairly bear; by continually substituting the proof of the existence of Episcopacy at a certain period, for the proof of its Divine right; and in general, by an extremely one-sided partisanship throughout." "As it is, therefore, an error on the one side to assert that the church must have Diocesan Bishops as of Divine right, so is it *an error on the other* to assert that she may not have them in her liberty as of human right. As there is no *jus divinum* for the Diocesan Episcopate, so is there, if the Episcopate be rightly ordered, no *jus divinum* against it."

---

*Bingham's Eccles. Antiq., Bk. 2, Ch. 2, Sect. 1., taken from Amalarius de Offic. Eccles., Bk. 2, Ch. 13.

†Divine Right of Forms of Church Government, vol. 2, part 2, chap. 6, quoted by Dr. Dick in his Lectures on Theology.

That the power of ordination should very early be reserved to Diocesan Bishops does not appear at all remarkable when we remember that, in virtue of their official position, they were the highest exponents of authority and power in the Church, as then constituted. This right they continued to exercise as the Church advanced through different stages of historical development, in subordination to their superiors in office. This was the case when the Diocesan Episcopate grew into the Metropolitan Episcopate, and so continued when the Metropolitan Episcopate logically developed into the Universal Episcopate, first claimed in the Greek Church, and afterwards with more success in the Roman Church, by constituting the Bishop of Rome the Metropolitan of Metropolitans. In this way the right of ordination and the succession of the ministry were intertwined and bound up with the Roman hierarchy, not by Divine right, but through the establishment and prevalence of a monarchical form of government in the Church. Throughout the ages which intervened between the time of the Apostles and the mighty Reformation of the sixteenth century, every Presbyter or Priest, as a divinely commissioned office-bearer in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostlic Church, founded by Jesus Christ, possessed in latent form the power of ordination, which, under proper circumstances, he could with other Presbyters have put into exercise. And when the Reformers by necessity separated themselves from the Roman hierarchy, they did not originate a new Church, but simply cast off the shell of Romanism, which had hardened around the true life of the holy Catholic Church, and was stunting its growth. The Reformation was not a protest against the Catholic Church, but only against the then existing Roman form of the Church. It was in the strictest sense a reformation within the bosom of the Catholic Church; the historical product of its life, which, growing in might for ages, burst forth in new forms, and then the powers originally granted to Presbyters were reasserted and put into exercise.

The form which the Protestant Church assumed during the Reformation differed in many respects radically from Romanism, but the Church under this new form was nevertheless a legitimate continuation of the Catholic Church. For "the Reformers firmly believed in the Church as the Body of Christ, being in order before its members, over them, and as carrying in its bosom, from the Head, the only hope and the only resources of salvation for men. Hence their zeal in holding fast to the old power beneath the powerful struggles of the new. Their ministry carried with it the old succession of ordination; their sacraments were adhered to in their true sacramental sense and power; their faith was the *Creed*, as it reigned from the earliest age; their Cultus owned the objective and sacramental, and had its home in the bosom of the Church; and their government rested, in its ultimate ground, on the authority of the Church."*

All this is true not only of the Reformation in England, where the Episcopal form of Church government was retained, but also of Continental Europe, where the Presbyterian form of government was introduced. Neither did the Church of England then regard Bishops as an order of the ministry, superior, by Divine right, to Presbyters. This fact is attested by the Book of Common Prayer itself. According to the Ordinal of Edward VI., restored by Elizabeth, Priests were consecrated Bishops without a word in reference to the communication of any additional ministerial power even, and without any mention of Episcopacy.† The same fact also appears from the conduct and writings of the English divines of that period. These eminent theologians fully and freely acknowledge the validity of the non-Episcopal Protestant ministry of Germany.

---

*Dr. Harbaugh: MERCERSBURG REVIEW, 1855, Jan. No.

† The words used in ordaining Presbyters were the following (taken by Milner from Bishop Sparrow's Collection, p. 158, and given by him in "End of Controversy," Letter 29): "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained; and be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments." For the consecration of Bishops these words (Ibid., p. 164) were used: "Take the Holy

"It is notorious," says Edwin Hall, "that the English Reformers uniformly treated the non-Episcopal foreign Churches (Lutheran and Reformed) as true Churches and ministers."*

Gaillard testifies, "that the Cranmers, Ridleys, Latimers, Hoopers, Jewells, and Hookers, of the days of Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth, though persuaded in favor of Episcopacy, and zealously attached to it, yet cordially embraced the Lutheran Churches as sisterly communions."†

Bishop Burnet remarks, that "not only those who penned the Thirty-nine Articles, but the body of the Church, for above half an age after, did acknowledge the foreign Churches to be true Churches, as to all the essentials of a Church."‡

Bishop Hall writes, "The Reformed Churches, which want this government (*i. e.* of Bishops), we do love and honor as our sister Churches, as the dear spouse of Christ. Your uncharitableness offers to choke me with those scandalous censures and disgraceful terms, which some of ours have let fall upon those Churches and their eminent professors; which, I confess, it is more easy to be sorry for than, on some hands, to excuse."§

"Dr. Jackson, Bishop Sanderson, Cousin, Bishop of Durham, and Bishop Taylor, have expressed themselves to the same effect."‖

Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of hands." These forms were in perfect harmony with the decision of of Cranmer, that "Bishops and Priests were no two things, but one and the same office."

More than one hundred years afterwards, in 1662, THE ORDINAL WAS CHANGED. The form of ordaining a Presbyter was thus altered: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands: Whose sins thou shalt forgive," &c. The form of consecrating Bishops was thus enlarged: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee."

* Puritans and their Principles, p. 279.

† History of the Reformation, p. 552.

‡ Expositions of the Articles, Art. XXIII.

§ Hall's works, vol. 9, p. 690, Pratt's Ed., 1808.

‖ Ecclesia Lutherana, by Dr. J. A. Seiss, p. 90.

Accordingly Dr. Stone says: "In those days of close searching into the essence and nature of things spiritual and ecclesiastical, there was no idea, among this class of English Divines, of shutting the Reformed Continental Churches out of the pale of visible Catholicism; but they held them to be the Church of England's dearest sisters abroad."*

The "judicious" Hooker goes farther than this, and acknowledges a well-known fact, which the history of the Reformation fully confirms, in these graceful terms: "For my own part, I dare not deny the salvation of the Lutheran Churches, *which have been the chiefest instruments of ours.*"†

Dr. Cousin very pertinently adds: "If we renounce all the ministers of Germany, what then will become of the Protestant party? If the Church and kingdom of England acknowledged them, as they did, why should we, that are but private persons, utterly disclaim their communion?"‡

These testimonies stand fast. Modern Anglicanism *dare not* ignore them.§

That there were irregularities in the succession of the non-Episcopal Protestant ministry in the time of the Reformation, as perhaps in the case of Calvin, who in the Roman Church was only a sub-deacon, and, it may be, never ordained to the priesthood, is not denied. How then do we vindicate the validity of our Protestant ministry? "Not by any outward succession in the case of the ministry, nakedly and separately considered; but certainly not by any theory, either, which overthrows the necessity of a true historical succession in the life of the Church and makes it competent for any body of Christians, under any circumstances, to start an entirely new Church. It is the life of the Church as such, the life of the Church as an organic historical whole, which alone can fully legitimate and clothe with power the needful organs of this life, and their necessary functions. If then we must admit some disturbance in the ordinary law of ministerial succession at the Reformation, it does not follow at once that the succession itself for this reason fell to the ground; the true succession lay in the life of the Church as a whole; and if it can be shown that *this* gave birth to the Reformation, it must be allowed to have been sufficient at the same time to make good, in the way of inward reproductive force, any *unavoidable* defect that was found to attend, in this revolution, the outward genealogy of the Protestant ministry. After all, it is the Church, the presence of Christ's life in His body, which supports the true line of the ministry, and not the line of the ministry that upholds mechanically the being and authority of the Church. On this broad principle we justify the Reformation. It was the product of the old Catholic Church itself; the central consciousness of the Christian world had been struggling towards it for centuries before; it was in the end the organic outburst plainly of the life of Christianity, as an objective historical whole, which simply laid hold of the Reformers, and brought itself to pass by them, as its organs, without any calculation of their own."*

---

*Discourses on the Church, p. 120.

†Sermon on Habak. i. 4, appendix to Ecc. Polity; Complete Works, vol. 2, p. 307. Appleton Ed.

‡ Letter to Cordel, February 7, 1650.

§ In the "Annotated Book of Common Prayer," a very learned and in many respects admirable work, edited by Rev. John Henry Blunt, M. A., the author of the Introduction to the Ordinal, with the characteristic modesty of the Anglican divines of the present age, makes use of the following remarkable language, which deserves very high commendation for its veracity, and which we recommend as a fine specimen of the Christian charity for which that school of English theologians who delight to call themselves Anglican Catholics, has of late years become quite notorious: "The Catholic Church has *ever* held this doctrine, that true ministrations of grace depend on *Episcopal* ministries, and has *always* regarded all other ministries, *whether assumed to be conferred by Presbyters*, undertaken at will, or bestowed by a call from the congregation, *to be wholly invalid.* Luther, Knox and Wesley were but priests, Whitefield a deacon, Calvin a sub-deacon, and others mere laymen; every mission by their hands is therefore *absolutely null and void, according to scriptural authority, apostolic practice, and the unbroken tradition of eighteen centuries!!*" A very *Blunt* assertion indeed—but an assertion that sounds very flat in connection with the statements of the illustrious worthies quoted above.

If, however, our Roman Catholic and Episcopalian friends will not accept this solution of the difficulty, we beg leave to remind them of certain defects in the succession of the ministry in their communions, judged according to their own theories of the ministry. Behold the following admission, made by a prominent Roman Catholic: "I grant, sir, that, from the various commotions and accidents to which all sublunary things are subject, there have been several vacancies or interregnums in the Papacy ; but none of them have been of such a lengthened duration as to prevent a *moral* (*?*) continuation of the Popedom, or to hinder the execution of the important office annexed to it. I grant, also, that there have been rival Popes and unhappy schisms in the Church, particulary one great schism, at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century."* Janus, in his book on "The Pope and the Council," page 43, mentions other and greater difficulties. He says: "Since the eighth century the ordinations of certain Popes began to be annulled, and the Bishops and Priests ordained by them were compelled to be re-ordained. This occurred first in 769, when Constantine II., who had got possession of the Papal chair by force of arms, and kept it for thirteen months, was blinded and deposed at a synod, and all his ordinations pronounced invalid. But the strongest case occurred at the end of the ninth century, after the death of Pope Formosus, when the repeated rejections of his ordinations threw the whole Italian Church into the greatest confusion, and produced a general uncertainty as to whether there were any valid sacraments in Italy. Auxilius, who was a contemporary, said that through this universal rejection and repetition of orders (*ordinatio, exordinatio, et superordinatio*) matters had come to such a pass in Rome that for twenty years the Christian religion had been interrupted and extinguished in Italy."

---

* Dr. J. W. Nevin, MERCERSBURG REVIEW, 1849, July No., p. 385.

Stubborn facts also stare Episcopalians in the face. Milner, ("End of Controversy," Letter xxix.) makes the following statement of these facts: "The chief question which remains to be discussed concerns the ministry of the Church of England: namely, whether the first Protestant bishops, appointed by Queen Elizabeth, when the Catholic bishops were turned out of their sees, did or did not receive valid consecration from some other bishop, who himself was validly consecrated? *The discussion of this question has filled many volumes, the result of which is that the orders are, to say the least, exceedingly doubtful.* For, first, it is certain that the doctrine of the Fathers of this Church was very loose, as to the necessity of consecration and ordination. Its chief founder, Cranmer, solemnly subscribed his name to the position that princes and governors, no less than bishops, can make Priests, and that no consecration is appointed by Scripture to make a Bishop or Priest. In like manner, Barlow, on the validity of whose consecration that of Matthew Parker and of all succeeding Anglican bishops chiefly rests, preached openly that the king's appointment, without any orders whatsoever, suffices to make a bishop. This doctrine seems to have been broached by him to meet the objection that he himself had never been consecrated: in fact, the record of such a transaction has been hunted for in vain, during these two hundred years. Secondly, it is evident, from the books of controversy, still extant, that the Catholic doctors, Harding, Bristow, Stapleton, and Cardinal Allen, who had been fellow-students and intimately acquainted with the first Protestant Bishops, under Elizabeth, and particularly with Jewel, bishop of Sarum, and Horne, bishop of Winton, constantly reproached them, in the most pointed terms, that they had never been consecrated at all; and that the latter, in their voluminous replies, never accepted of the challenge or refuted the charge, otherwise than by ridiculing the Catholic consecration Thirdly, it appears that after an interval of fifty years from the beginning of the controversy, namely, in the year 1613, when Mason, chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, published a work, referring to an alleged register at Lambeth of Archbishop Parker's consecration by Barlow, assisted by Coverdale and others, the learned Catholics universally exclaimed that the register was a forgery, unheard of till that date, and asserted, among other arguments, that, admitting it to be true, it was of no avail, as the pretended consecrator of Parker, though he had sat in several sees, had not himself been consecrated for any of them."

---

*Milner "End of Controversy," Letter xxx.

Since, then, we are all obliged to acknowledge, the Romanist as well as the Protestant, the Episcopalian as well as the Presbyterian, that there have been, at different times in the history of the Church, *disturbances in the ordinary law* of ministerial succession, must we also admit that the succession itself has for this reason been interrupted, and thus deprived of its validity? Not at all. For it is the presence of Christ's life in His Body as an organic historical whole—which life is broader and deeper than its ordinary manifestations, and therefore not absolutely limited by them—that supports the true succession of the ministry, and by its innate reproductive power overcomes the defects which, under extraordinary circumstances, imperil the historical continuance of the One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. At all times and under all circumstances, in the midst of world-crises, attended with great confusion and uncertainty on the part of men, just as really as before and after these ecclesiastical upheavals, the Lord Jesus Christ, by the power of His divine-human life, present through the Holy Ghost in His mystical body, has continued in His Church the needful organs of His life and their necessary functions, so that the gates of Hades have at no time prevailed against His Church founded on a rock, neither have the power and authority of the original commission given to the Apostles been lost. His promise: "*Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world,*" has at no time been withdrawn. His grace and power have proven themselves sufficient for every immergency. Sects that have assumed to create a ministry of their own, possess indeed only a humanly appointed ministry; but the Church Catholic, in spite of all its lamentable divisions into Roman, Greek, Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed, Presbyterian, Methodist, Episcopalian, and still other branches, has a ministry as truly valid as that which the Church of the first century possessed.

ART. VI.—THE GENERAL SYNOD AT FORT WAYNE.

The General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States met in triennial session at Fort Wayne, Indiana, May 19th, 1875. This is the second time in immediate succession that this body has held its sessions in the West, having met in 1872 at Cincinnati. The entertainment of the Synod was most hospitable and pleasant, although it became necessary to seek this entertainment, to a considerable extent, in families of Churches outside our own communion.

Fort Wayne is a beautiful and growing city of about 25,000 inhabitants. It is situated in the northern part of Indiana, on what is called *the summit*, where the waters divide, some of the streams flowing northward to the lake, others southward to the Ohio river. It contains many fine public buildings, and about thirty churches. The Roman Catholics have a Cathedral and several other churches, the Lutherans four, the Presbyterians three, the Reformed two (German), churches. The Missouri Lutherans have a college here, or a gymnasium, which stands in some connection with a higher institution in St. Louis.

There was very little business transacted by the Synod at Fort Wayne, except mere routine work, such as reviewing the proceedings of the lower judicatories, electing members of the two missionary boards, delegates to corresponding bodies, etc. It might seem from this fact that it possesses but little significance for the Church at large. Yet we believe this Synod was of very great importance, and will exert a large and happy influence, for reasons somewhat outside its particular transactions. To these we will refer after we have noticed some of the particular business transacted.

The majority this time fell on the side of the churchly and conservative portion of the Church, as has, indeed, been the case in every General Synod, except the one held at Cincinnati in 1872.* Rev. Dr. W. K. Zieber was elected president by thirteen majority, which was the only vote, as we now remember, with the exception of the vote on the contested seat of the secundus delegate from the Lebanon Classis, which could be called a strictly party vote.

---

* The *Christian World*, in its first issue after the meeting of the General Synod, stated that if the Western or opposition delegates had all been present, the majority would have been the other way to the extent of *fifteen* or *twenty* votes. In the next issue of June 3d, the editor repeats this assertion without naming the number of votes that might have been had on the other side, and adds: "It is quite significant, in view of the watchfulness and diligence of those on the other side, that notwithstanding the majority elected to represent the Church as a whole was with those who stood in opposition."

Of course all this is mere assertion. There was a majority of thirteen on the vote for president. This majority would have been increased by six, if the eastern delegates had all been present, and by at least two more if the East had so desired, in effect *four* more, making in all a majority of twenty-three, and we know that all the absentees on the other side would not nearly have been able to overcome this majority. We take little interest in counting majorities; the time is past for that, we trust, in our Church; but we refer to the matter here as an evidence of the careless and partisan statements that go out for truth in the columns of the *Christian World.*

Public Theological Teaching.

The first subject that awakened any special attention was the overture from the Pittsburgh Synod, relating to the authority of District Synods in the matter of public theological teaching within their bounds. The case originated in the Clarion Classis, which claimed the right, in view of the decision in the Super appeal case at Cincinnati, to establish a theological school, or seminary, in connection with the Clarion Collegiate Institute, within their bounds, independently of the permission or authority of the Pittsburgh Synod. That Synod denied the right under the Constitution, and requested the General Synod to repeal *so much* of the action in the Super appeal case as might be in conflict with their decision. The reference to the Super appeal case was evidently made under the impression that, in some sort, it stood in the way of independent action by the General Synod in another case. The view, however, was taken that such repeal, in a judicial case once decided, was not necessary in order to take contrary action in another independent case. The action of the highest court in the Church in a specific case brought up by appeal, is final. It cannot be reopened by the same court at a subsequent sitting, although if what is claimed to be a violation of the Constitution by the party complained of be brought up a second time by the lower court, the supreme judiciary could act upon it as a new case, the effect of the action not reaching back, however, behind the time covered by the first decision. In this way it would have been competent for the Eastern Synod at any time subsequent to the decision at Cincinnati to have instituted new proceedings against the theological teachers at Ursinus College, and carried the case up under new circumstances and with new pleas, and obtained a new decision from the General Synod. This rule, we believe, holds in all civil courts, where a course of action charged with being unconstitutional continues after a decision has been reached in the Supreme Court. It becomes then a new case, and the decision may be contrary to the first decision, without repealing the former decision. If this be true in regard to a case once decided when brought up a second time under new circumstances, much more must it be true of an entirely different case, though involving the same principles of constitutional law. The Supreme Court of the United States may decide at one time that the payment of a certain debt with a certain kind of money is legal and satisfactory, and yet in a subsequent similar case it may decide that it is illegal and unsatisfactory. The latter decision does not repeal or reverse the first decison, but the first decision is not a hindrance or bar to the second decision.

According to this view, the committee on the overture reported that in reaching a decision on the case brought before the General Synod by the overture from the Pittsburg Synod, it was not necessary to consider the decision of a special case by the Cincinnati Synod.* The Synod at Fort Wayne was not bound in the case by the action at Cincinnati. It had independent authority in the case brought before it by the Pittsburgh Synod.

Accordingly the report went on to assert the clear and distinct meaning of the Constitution, declaring that the District Synod has exclusive and direct control over all public theological teaching (in the Reformed Church, of course,) within its bounds. This principle was contested by the opposition. Dr. J. H. Good, for instance, took the position that whilst the Constitution says the District Synod *may* establish a theological seminary within its bounds, it is not implied that any body else may *not* do the same thing. This argument was met by the remark that if all parties whosoever have the right to establish public theological teaching, it would be a remarkable thing that the Constitution should designate a Synod only as having this right. It would be as though when the law says that all male citizens of the age of twenty-one years *may* vote, it is not implied that all others may *not* vote! The argument evidently broke down. The Synod, with the exception of a small minority, held that the statement of the meaning of the Constitution as given in the report was correct. But many who believed this, yet did not wish to see the case decided at Cincinnati re-opened. Some even at Cincinnati voted to sustain the Super appeal case, who, to this day, state that they then believed, and now believe, that in a normal state of the Church the teaching of theology at Ursinus College is irregular and unconstitutional. The report stated in the preamble that the appeal case at Cincinnati need not come under consideration, and consistently with this the majority of Synod were willing to add the resolution to the report, that in the decision reached there is no intention either to reverse or affirm the decision in the special case at Cincinnati.

---

*The following is the report of the committee:

We regard the reference to the action of the General Synod at Cincinnati as only incidental to the main object in view. Inasmuch as that action merely related to a specific case, and gave no utterance as to the meaning and intent of the Constitution bearing on the subject brought to our notice in this overture, your committee do not deem it necessary that such action be brought under consideration. But for the protection of the District Synods we submit the following action:

Resolved, That according to the clear provision of the Constitution of the Church, all public theological teaching within the bounds of any particular Synod is placed under the direct control of that District Synod.

This resolution is presented as a sufficient declaration of the meaning and intent of the Constitution bearing on this general subject.

Resolved, That nothing in the preceding resolution shall be construed as reversing or affirming the action of the General Synod of Cincinnati in the Super appeal case.

In order more clearly to understand the force of this additional resolution, it must be borne in mind that Dr. Bomberger had offered an amendment, stating in addition to the above, that this Synod in taking this action does not mean at all to call into question that the theological teaching at Ursinus is regular, lawful, and constitutional. This even many of Dr. Bomberger's own friends were unwilling to listen to or accept, and he felt himself compelled to withdraw it. The report of the committee was then adopted nearly unanimously.

The clear meaning of the action is, therefore, that while the Synod did not feel called upon to pass on a case not before it, and so far as that specific case had been passed upon by a former Synod with which it had nothing to do, either as affirming or reversing, yet by a very heavy majority it did decide that the District Synod alone has direct and exclusive control over all public theological teaching within its bounds. The Synod *refused* to say that the course pursued by Dr. Bomberger in teaching theology is regular and constitutional.

The only rational meaning of the action, therefore, is that while the Synod is clear as to the Constitution, yet it does not go out of its way to say anythng in regard to the consitutionality of the theological teaching at Ursinus, because that case is not before it for action.

Here, then, the friends of order are willing to rest the case. The argument advanced by one speaker, in a German address, that it is desirable to allow a certain measure of freedom to different phases of theological teaching, as is done in the same university in Germany, is not relevant, because the question is not what is desirable, but what is constitutional. The cases are not at all parallel; but even if they were the argument would have no force, because our Constitution here stands in the way.

As this subject has an importance quite beyond the particular case with which it is now connected, we may be allowed to present the argument for the Constitution at a little greater length. We were astonished to hear Dr. J. H. Good declare that he was fully convinced—of nothing more so than—that the Constitution never designed to limit the control of public theological teaching to the Synod. Any Classis, or board, or minister, he asserted, has the same right as the Synod. Many of the opposition concede that the teaching of theology in the school at Ursinus is irregular according to the Constitution; but they say it is a war measure, and in war the laws are silent. But Dr. Good holds that such teaching is perfectly constitutional.

What is the object, then, of providing in the Constitution that Synod may establish and control a theological seminary? Why is it provided that it shall be supervised by a Board of Visitors, that its professors shall be duly elected by Synod and inducted into office by being put under a solemn oath? Why all this? Is it not because of the great responsibility that attaches to this interest? Now, suppose a Classis has the same right, or a board which may not even be composed of members of the Church, or any minister at will, does not the very supposition reveal the fallacy? Why should that teaching which is conducted by Synod be required to be surrounded by certain guards and inspection, and yet the field be thrown open to others to carry it on without these?

The argument here is not intended to bear against all private theological instruction, such as has always been known in our Church. That is one thing, and the organization of a public class or school of theology, to which students are invited, and for the support of which funds are collected and professors appointed by a Board of Trustees under no ecclesiastical control whatever, *that* is another thing. And when this latter is organized avowedly in opposition to the seminary of the Synod, and carried forward with the view of supplanting the seminary of the Synod, the case becomes still more absurd. Plain common sense, as well as the judgment of competent legal talent, are one here in saying that such teaching is clearly unconstitutional.

The argument of Dr. Bomberger, which differs somewhat from that of Dr. Good, bases itself upon the inherent right or authority of every ordained minister to teach theology. This has been fully answered. We grant the inherent authority as pertaining to the ministerial office. We are willing to grant, too, for the sake of the argument, as Dr. Bomberger claimed at Fort Wayne, that the office of minister is higher, or more comprehensive, than that of teacher of theology. But now, what authority is set to direct and control this inherent function of the minister? A minister cannot even preach where and when he pleases, although Christ has said, "Go ye into all the world and preach my gospel." The Classis decides where he is to exercise the functions of his office as a preacher. Who regulates the exercise of the particular function of the minister in what is understood as the teaching of theology? The minister's congregation, so to speak, here is the class of theological students. What authority instals him over this particular congregation (class), and authorizes him to preach (teach theology) to them? The Constitution says, the *Synod.* But these men say, any authority—a Classis, a board of trustees, or the will of the individual minister, can do it.

It is said that a minister teaching theology in such public capacity, without the sanction of Synod, is still guarded by being responsible to his Classis. But this reveals already the incongruity; for then there would be no meaning in so carefully stating and providing in the Constitution that a teacher of theology is responsible, in that office, only to his Synod. Any theory that has to sustain itself by changing this responsibility, thereby confesses that it is in conflict with the Constitution. And all this becomes of greater force when we consider that the Synod is the original source of jurisdiction in our Church, and that the Classes were formed with limited and reserved powers, of which this is clearly one. In the organization of the General Synod no change was made on this subject.

The only alternative, therefore, is to fall back on the theory of congregationalism, and oppose all power of Classes, Synods, and theological seminaries, as was done in a speech by Dr. Welker at the late General Synod. But the day is past for the revival of that sort of independency in a Church like ours.

We make these remarks here with no feeling whatever in regard to the particular case of the theological school at Ursinus. That obtained the protection of one General Synod, and has not been disturbed by another. We have no wish whatever that any attempt shall be made to disturb it at the sacrifice of the peace of the Church. But there is a higher interest concerned, viz: the Constitution of the Church, which was not made for Ursinus, nor Lancaster, nor Tiffin, but for the Church, and which lives on in its authority amid all changes of schools. That this Constitution teaches what is asserted in the first resolution of the report at Fort Wayne (which is not in conflict, we think, with the second), of this we have full confidence. And we are perfectly willing to rest our judgment here, and await for its vindication the time when the subject will be free from the particular interests and contentions that now embarrass it. When that time comes there will be but one judgment, and that will be, not the decision at Cincinnati, but the decision in the first resolution of the report at Fort Wayne.

We have taken pains to present at some length the nature and meaning of the action on this subject, because of its intrinsic importance, and because it was pretty much the only case in which any considerable interest was elicited in regard to the theological issues that formerly agitated the Church. The majority of the eastern delegates had no idea, we believe, that the case was to come up. For our own part we had entirely lost sight of it, and had no thought that any contest would be opened on this general subject. As it is, we rejoice that the meaning of the Constitution has been asserted with so much unanimity, whatever may be the course of individuals in regard to it.*

---

*The *Christian World* of June 3d, after stating the action contained in the report on this subject, which we give in a preceding note, says :

"According to the actions above recorded of the last two general Synods, the Theological Department of Ursinus College has the full and unequivocal sanction of the Church, and is a recognized theological school of the Church."

In the same article the *World* unwittingly gives the resolution offered by Dr. Bomberger, which was *intended* to commit the Synod at Fort Wayne in the way

Home and Foreign Missions.

The subject of Home Missions in the proper sense hardly came before Synod. This is to be regretted. It was indeed to be expected that the General Home Board would have little power to direct in the work of home missions. This interest, by permission, is now carried on by the District Synods. In the present state of things, this is no doubt the best course. The time may come, and come perhaps sooner than we now expect, when it will be otherwise, when the General Board will become a power; for, unless we are deceived, the unification of the Church under the General Synod is now rapidly working towards most satisfactory results.

But while this is the case now, it would have been well if the reports of the lower boards had gone up to the General Synod through the General Board. In that case the subject of home missions would have come directly before the Synod, and awakened new interest. These reports might have then appeared on the minutes of the General Synod, and thus the whole interest and work of home missions might have been brought more directly before the whole Church. The effort to have these operations of the lower boards spread upon the minutes without passing the reports through the

---

the *World* asserts it was committed; but, unfortunately for the editor, that resolution was not passed. It could find no favor or support. The following is the resolution referred to:

"*Resolved,* That nothing in the preceding resolution shall be regarded or considered as a reversion or repudiation of the decision of the General Synod of Cincinnati in regard to this subject; and further, that the action now submitted is not designed in any way to reflect upon the constitutional legitimacy of the Theological Department of the institution named, or to imply that the several departments of said institution are not worthy of ecclesiastical regard."

Dr. Bomberger tried to have this accepted, but finding no prospect of obtaining even a respectable minority vote on it, he felt compelled to withdraw it, and the one given in the report was presented by Dr. Gerhart, and adopted. It will be perceived that in Dr. Bomberger's resolution he says, "that nothing in the preceeding resolution shall be regarded or considered as a reversion or repudiation of the decision of the General Synod of Cincinnati, *in regard to this subject,*" that is, the general subject of synodical authority over theological teaching. The resolution adopted says, this Synod neither *affirms* nor reverses the Cincinnati decision, not on the general subject, but on *the Super appeal case.*

The fact that Dr. Bomberger thus endeavored to get in a negative endorsement of the theological teaching at Ursinus College—in the words, "the action now submitted is *not* designed to reflect on the legitimacy," etc., of said teaching—and that he failed, that Synod refused to entertain it, proves conclusively that the Synod did *not* do what the *Christian World* asserts it did. But we expect to see the *World* go on re-asserting the same thing, as though it were true.

hands of the General Board, involved too much labor by the Stated Clerk, and was not the regular way of reaching the object.

On the subject of *foreign missions* there was a lively and interesting discussion. The subject came up in the way of a lengthy report from the board of the General Synod—though by some oversight the report was not read until the report of the committee on missions was made. For some years past the Reformed Church has been aiding to a small extent the work carried on in India, by a German Evangelical Missionary Association. Several ministers belonging to our Church are laboring in that field. There has been a growing desire, however, that we should have a foreign mission of our own, under the direct supervision of our Church. At a previous meeting of the General Synod, Japan had been designated as a proper and promising field.

Recently that field was brought anew to the notice of the Church through Rev. F. Fox, one of our home missionaries in California. Under his instructions a young Japanese was converted to Christianity, and was received by baptism into the communion of the Church. He belonged to a good family in Japan, and after returning to his native country, where he now remains, he exerted his influence in favor of Christianity in the family to which he belongs, and among his friends. He then wrote to his friend and spiritual father, Rev. F. Fox, urging him to come to Japan, and labor as a missionary there, promising to aid him in his work in every way he could. Brother Fox brought the matter to the attention of the home board under which he is laboring, and so it came before General Synod.

In view of the whole state of the case, it was resolved that the Board of Foreign Missions should go forward at once, and begin the work of establishing a foreign mission of our own. There is in the treasury upwards of *four thousand* dollars, waiting for some use, and with this it is believed a beginning can be made. If the right man can be found, there is no doubt that a general interest in the subject will be awakened throughout the Church, and if a mission is established it will receive liberal support.

The Reformed Church had so much work to do in the direction of home missions, and the foreign field in these later ages seems to be so much shut up against the reception of Christianity, that many had come to think it would be best to devote all our energy to the former work, and withhold any attention for the present to the latter. But this clearly is not a right position to take, and it has not been satisfactory to our people. With other branches of the Christian Church, we are under obligation to labor for the spread of the Gospel in all lands and among all nations. It is to be hoped that an auspicious beginning may now be made of a work in the foreign field, which will prove a lasting benefit to many there, as well as to the Church at home.

The English and the German.

The question as to the proper policy of the Church in regard to the relation of English and German to each other, is one of the weightiest and most difficult practical questions that can claim attention. By the German here we must understand the European German, for the American German, which is strongest in East Pennsylvania, has no particular difficulty in getting along with the English. The English and the Germans here move on harmoniously together in the same congregations, classes, and synods. The other German portion of the Church, which stands in closer relation to the German immigration, especially in the larger towns and cities, where the distinct German life and customs are more rigidly maintained, have for sometime sought for themselves a separate sphere of activity in the Reformed Church. The constitution has been so changed that they have been enabled to form German Classes, and even District Synods, on the same territory occupied by the English Classes and Synods. Two such German district synods have already been formed, embracing twelve German classes.

It was thought by many that this policy of separation from the beginning was unwise. This country is prevailingly English, and will no doubt remain so for all time to come; that is, the English language will continue to be the vernacular, the language of our courts and schools, though the American nationality itself will be cosmopolitan, incorporating in itself the various nationalities of Europe, yea, of the world. In this view it would seem that the German Churches should seek to introduce the English language as rapidly as possible, or as may be consistent with a proper regard for the necessities of the German-speaking people now within our communion, and the German emigrants constantly arriving.

It was thought, too, that the association in the Classes and Synods would be beneficial to both, as bringing each into better acquaintance with the other. In this way the Church would grow into closer unity.

The German brethren, however, thought that in this union the English interest so predominated over the German, that their interests did not receive a proper share of attention, and therefore they asked for a separation in the lower judicatories on the basis of language. This separation was freely acceded to by the English portion of the Church, because the Germans urged it; although many believed, as already stated, that the separation would not work beneficially for the interests of the whole Church, not even for the Germans themselves in the end.

One danger attending such separation, among others, is that the two interests may come into conflict, and that the German portion may be tempted to throw its weight, *en masse*, into the scale in deciding questions other than those pertaining to the English and the German. This danger has already been to some extent actualized, though we believe a better turn has been given by the late General Synod. The fact that the Germans in a body, with a few exceptions, on one occasion, threw their weight against the old Eastern Synod, in a matter which had nothing to do with the German and English question, but which was a matter belonging wholly to the jurisdiction of the Eastern Synod in conducting its theological teaching, as is now confessed even by themselves so far as the general principle is concerned—this it was which aroused a feeling in the Eastern Synod and those who sympathized with it theologically, constituting at least one-half the Church, and even more we believe, that such danger would be disastrous to the unity of the Church. The English portion of the Church are not driven together by the same causes which unite the Germans. The English divide on theological issues as well as on questions of practical policy. If now the Germans carry their united force into questions other than those which pertain to their separate interests, it could not result otherwise than to awaken suspicion and distrust in one or the other English section. Such a course would destroy the freedom of the

English. It would be the same as though the Roman Catholic population were to throw their whole weight, *en masse*, into one or other of the political parties into which the country is divided. The English never unite in the same way in deciding a controversy that arises among the Germans. They usually are divided. And this is as it should be.

If now the Germans were to use their power in this way when any question comes to be decided which involves more particularly a difference among the English section of the Church, it is not difficult to see that it would lead to such a state of feeling as would eventually rend the Church asunder. And for the argument it matters not on which side they go. It is their voting together, in a body, that creates the danger.

Although we believe the matters in controversy are now passed in the main, it cannot give offence, we think, to say that we have not been able to understand why the Germans so generally should have set themselves against the spirit and teaching of the old Eastern Synod. Whatever defects there may have been, and may still be, for we do not claim infallibility or perfection for it, in the theological teaching endorsed and supported by that Mother Synod of the Reformed Church in this country, its general animus has been such as to commend it to the Germans. We believe now, and we have had assurances to the effect, that the German portion of our Church, at least the churchly and conservative element among the Germans, hold more in common with the theology of the Mother Synod than with the theology of the opposition, and we believe that time will demonstrate this. There are some even among the English opposition who will yet come to see this—yea, see it now—that the old Eastern Synod, and those Synods in sympathy with it, hold a churchly and conservative position which is the strongest safeguard against unchurchly and radical tendencies, and which will best protect the sacred customs and usages of the Reformed Church.

We know what use may be made of what we have now said on this point; but we have said it candidly and honestly, and we are willing to wait for time to attest the truth of what we have said.

We come now to the particular point raised by the overture from the Iowa Classis, asking that steps be taken by the General Synod looking towards a separation between the German and the English in this highest judicatory of the Church. In our opinion that was one of the most important questions brought before the Synod. It received but little attention, because the sentiment of the Synod, on the part of the English, as well as the German, was very decidedly opposed to such separation. In one view we were perfectly satisfied and highly pleased with this sentiment. As our view has always been that it would be best for the interests of all concerned to remain together in the lower judicatories of the Church, provided both sides would feel satisfied, so consistently we could but rejoice if the General Synod can remain undivided.

But there are several things that work against this unity with logical and historical force, and which ought to be considered and weighed more carefully than a mere expression of sentiment by vote. Logically the division on the basis of language in the lower courts presses towards a division in the same way in the General General Synod. The case of the different States all united under one general government is not analogous. The proper analogy would be the formation of separate courts and other organizations on the basis of language in the States. This would logically press to like organizations in the federal courts. It would almost be a necessity.

There is a historical force at work in this division in the lower judicatories, in the very separation and separate education, which will tend to make the English and German more and more strangers to each other. There is a law of association and influence at work here which is not dependent on our own will or wish.

Add to this now the danger of keeping up the division really in the General Synod under a formal unity. This was referred to in the debates in the late General Synod at Fort Wayne. The idea of pleasing the Germans, gaining the favor and the vote of the Germans, had grown so common that hardly a question could be raised but some one would be on his feet to say a special word to "our German brethren." It might be a purely constitutional question, in reference to which all rights, German and English, are equal; and yet in its decision the appeal must be made to the German brethren, as though some way or other the question of language must decide every other question. Such appeals we know are no compliment to the intelligence and independence of thought of the Germans. We would rather be defeated over and over again, and remain always defeated, than carry a position by such appeals. But the fact nevertheless remains that there is a general feeling that the English and the Germans do not coalesce in the General Synod.

This feeling is strengthened by the fact that the Germans hold separate meetings during the sessions of the General Synod. We impute to them no evil design in this. Their meetings may relate to matters entirely of their own concern; but yet, why have matters entirely of their own concern when we meet in General Synod? There the division should disappear. The Germans should be willing to have the English sit in judgment with themselves, even in matters that are purely of German interest, and the English should be willing to have the Germans do likewise in relation to English interests. Indeed there should be no German, no English interests known there. The remark is often made, "the English do not understand our wants," and the English might say also, "the Germans do not understand our wants."

But if we act on that principle, we are just preparing the way, placing the entering wedge, for a division of the General Synod on the basis of language. The question here is, not so much what we may be in favor of—the question is, to what are the logic of events and historical forces tending? And in this view, although the sentiment was so generally opposed to the very thought of a division, yet there were forces at work there looking directly to that result, and some we fear may have been largely involved in those forces and carried along by them, who would have been shocked at the mention of division.

It is a question also whether if a true and full union is maintained in the General Synod it will not work backward, with logical force, to bring about union again in the lower judicatories. The law certainly works both ways. A division in all the lower courts will work strongly to a division in the General Synod; and a union, if it can be maintained, in the General Synod, will work towards a reunion below. Our present position is somewhat anomalous, and to maintain it will require great caution and care. We favor it, if it works for the good of the Church; but if it becomes only a source of bitterness and division, and is maintained only by a dead form of union, then the sooner the division were effected, the better it would be for all concerned.

We believe, however, that some of these dangers have been overcome. There was a freer intermingling in the late Synod, and speeches directed specially to "our German brethren" were received with a smile. The association in the General Synod will serve to bring all sides closer together, and perhaps this separation into German and English will yield to the stronger bond of union. So at least we hope.

The Overture from the Presbyterian Church.

This overture was from the General Assembly of 1873, inviting the Reformed Church to unite in forming some kind of convention or congress of all Presbyterian Churches in the world. As the overture, in the form it reached us, invited only those Churches that "hold by the Westminster standards," and as we hold only by the Heidelberg Catechism, we could not accept the invitation. The last resolution, in the action taken in this matter, declared our willingness to coöperate in any proper movement looking towards a union of the *Reformed* Churches, on the basis, not of the Presbyterian system, but of the *consensus* of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation.

Presbyterial government and Calvinistic doctrine (which latter means always, now-a-days, the doctrine of unconditional predestination) form the basis of this proposed Pan-Presbyterian Union. It is somewhat singular that while the Presbyterian Churches of the present day so generally repudiate the original Calvinistic doctrine of the sacraments, which was the distinguishing characteristic of the Reformed Church during the Reformation—at least in the larger portion of it—they should imagine the whole Reformed interest now hangs on the doctrine of predestination. We have been assured by several leading Presbyterian ministers that the Presbyterian ministry in this country, with but few exceptions, now hold the Zwinglian and not the Calvinistic view of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This only confirms what was urged by Dr. Nevin years ago, that there has been a palpable falling off from the original view of this sacrament among the leading Reformed Churches of the Reformation period.

It is a question whether, when the age is looking and striving for a more general union of all the Churches, this separate movement for union in one section may not in the end prove rather a hindrance than a help to the general object. So far as it may have power to help in any way the interest of union, we bid it God speed.

Our Centennial Celebration.

The Synod, in accordance, we believe, with an overture from the old Eastern District Synod, took action providing for a celebration by our Church of the coming Centennial of the nation. An interesting report was offered on this subject by Dr. Welker, which was amended and adopted. It provides that a thanksgiving service shall be held in all our Churches on the Sunday or Sundays nearest the 4th of July, 1876, and a collection lifted in aid of Church extension. Also that a tract or pamphlet shall be prepared, giving a brief history of our Church, and of its progress and growth in this country, for general circulation. Drs. E. E. Higbee, B. Bausman and N. Gehr are the committee appointed to prepare this document.

There are some other matters in the proceedings of the General Synod which it would be interesting to notice, particularly the revision of the Constitution, which is now referred to a new committee composed of one member from each District Synod, but our limits do not allow us to refer to these. We have a few more words to say yet on what we regard as *the influence of this late General Synod on the peace and prosperity of the Church.*

We have never attended a General Synod in which more good feeling and unanimity prevailed. It was apparent, we think, that the Church has passed beyond the period of *the old theological controversy.* We believe that this controversy, as it has agitated our Church for the last quarter of a century, has accomplished much good, as well as been attended with some danger and evil. The substantial elements of our theology are incorporated into our church life, and will continue to live. But the controversy, in the form in which it has gone forward, must now give way to a new state of things. Controversy, or rather perhaps discussion, will continue. It is necessary to sound and wakeful life and progress. But the late General Synod seemed to us to indicate that the old controversies will no longer divide us in that judicatory. As an instance to show this, the *liturgical question* came up in an overture from the North Carolina Classis, but it had no power to produce a division. The Church has accepted the liberty afforded in this matter, since 1866, and further discussion would lead to no practical change. To the same effect is the fact that while almost every question that came before the Synod revealed the theological differences prevailing among us, yet in the votes reached there was a large degree of unanimity. That means, as we interpret it, that we are agreed to work together for the progress of the Church, while we will tolerate a certain amount of difference in theological views. We may be mistaken. We may have mistaken a mere lull in the storm for the end of it. But we give our impressions, when we say that we look forward to a period of greater good feeling and unanimity; and of course they must be received for what they are worth.

If we had the space, it would be interesting to add a word in reference to the *growth* of the Church.* The one old Mother Synod has grown into *six* District Synods, including over *forty* Classes. We are becoming established in all the larger cities of the West, which is due largely to the indomitable energy and arduous labors of our German ministers. In each of these cities the English portion of the Church should see to it that an English Church should be established. We have a Classis in California, and a Mission in Oregon. The Church is spreading in Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska. Never before, we believe, was our Reformed Church more prosperous.

---

* We append the following *statistics* copied from the *Reformed Era*, and taken from the Report on the State of the Church:

"One General Synod; 6 District Synods: 44 Classes; 637 Ministers; 107 Candidates for the Ministry; 1,355 Congregations; 144,351 Members; 89,568 Baptized—not confirmed; 30,960 added by Baptism; 19,138 added by Confirmation; 8,746 added by Certificate; 4,432 Dismissed; 8,637 Deaths; 1,157 Sunday-schools; 73,247 Sunday-school Scholars

"$497,217.26 General and Local Benevolence in three years.

"There are 15 periodicals and religious papers, English and German, published in the interest of this Church. There are 3 Theological Seminaries, 5 Colleges, 3 Female Seminaries, 5 Collegiate Institutes, and 2 Orphan Homes; 1 Board of Foreign Missions, 1 Board of Home Missions, and Eastern and Western Board of Publication.

"This statement as compared with the previous report, shows an increase of 2 Synods, 9 Classes, 51 Ministers, 43 Congregations, 14,050 Members, 16,280 Baptized Members, 136 Sunday schools, 10,309 Sunday-school Scholars.

"As the statistics of some Classes are not full and correct, these figures, made up only of what is reported to the district synods, are of course not a complete statement. They fall short rather than overreach the actual statistics."

We have to add yet, in conclusion, that the articles that appeared in the *Christian World*, the one in the Western, the other in the Eastern department, just on the eve of the meeting of the General Synod, formed a strange contrast with the spirit of the Synod to which we have just referred. An attack on the institutions at Lancaster, and a miserable misrepresentation of the worship conducted in them, was the greeting the *World* extended to the Eastern brethren on their arrival at the General Synod in the West! Perhaps they were intended to fire the Western Church, under the expectation of a different result in the organization of the Synod. If so, they were not only in exceedingly bad taste, but they failed entirely in their object. Such tirades have lost their power to stir up strife in the Church. They add no light to the theological questions that have been under consideration, and fall harmless now before those against whom they are directed. All such attempts to stir up bad blood will henceforth fail. Let a broader and deeper spirit prevail in our Church publications, and they will have power to aid in inaugurating the *New Era* of peace and prosperity in the Reformed Church in this country. T. G. A.

ART. VII.—PHILOSOPHY OF SUCCESS.

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF.

Webster gives the following definition of the word success: "The favorable or prosperous termination of anything attempted; a termination which answers the purpose intended." The great lexicographer seems to have but one aspect or side of the subject in view, with which he undertakes to deal; he brings out the subjective side, but apparently leaves untouched the broad field of objective powers that lies in the region beyond. Of course, personal activity and individual design have much to do with the termination of human affairs, so much indeed that the fact that there is a destiny that shapes our ends no matter how we may venture to shape them ourselves is frequently forgotten, and men think and act as if they were the absolute masters of their fortune. A mere glance at the testimony which comes from the experience of the ages, and allows us to get a glimpse of the secrets of the course of events, cannot fail to convince any candid observer that, with all his personal freedom and energy, man depends largely on the powers above him, and that therefore the philosophy of success is infinitely broader in its scope than any attempts and designs of individuals ever can be. Hence this subject can only be fairly dealt with when we judge it in the light of history, and bring to view the cardinal forces that have all along governed the destiny of our race.

The force that stands first in rank as a moulding power in history, is theology. We do not mean dogmatic theology, formulated scientifically and authoritatively promulgated as confessional standards; for in that character the force we are now speaking of is not old enough to claim a formative position in the early dawn of human progress. We mean the awful facts and sublime religous truths that have ever shaped biblical lore, and given world-historical significance and power to Christian culture. On this kind of theology, we mean to say, the race has been depending as its chief, nay, its only hope of progress in the true humanities of life, and in this historico-supernatural current have individuals been borne along toward the goal of prosperity, happiness and peace. The theology of the scriptures, as any historian may know, had much to do with the ideas, institutions, manners and customs of the nations; it became the moulding, controlling power of civilization, and within the sacred limits of this evangelico-biblical life-force of history lie all the possibilities of success, of a prosperous termination of human events, of a destiny as broad as the world, and as endless as eternity.

The poets and prophets of Israel looked into the future and, guided by the light from above, gave such direction to thought and life as was needed to bring the nations out of the darkness of idolatry and the confusion of heathen ignorance, and lead them forward in the sure path of redemption, peace and salvation. If we take into consideration the personal fortunes of these ancient seers, the lives of many of them must be taken as a failure ; for wealth, and position, and honor had they not; the fortunes of this world did not smile upon them, and not a few of them laid down their lives for the cause they maintained. But when we look beyond their personal fortunes, and begin to inquire into the influence their lives and writings have had on the fortunes of mankind, then the scene is marvelously shifted, and we behold them in glory, sitting as guardian angels at the helm, and magnanimously directing the course of the ages. In this matter it would not only be difficult, but absolutely impossible to find a parallel of success to the school of the Hebrew seers, in the ages in which they lived. The masterly productions of the classic era, which began to dawn when Hebrew prophets had almost come to the close of their heaven-appointed mission, are nothing to be compared with the simple and unadorned deliverances of these humble servants of the Most High, if we weigh them together in the balance of moral grandeur and the beneficent power of social emancipation. Great indeed has been the influence of the classics, but infinitely greater was that of the prophecies ; and no one, who has studied the progress of the race carefully, can hesitate to prostrate himself in the dust before that Providence which has raised up, in the distant ages of the past, a company of holy men, who, regardless of personal consequences, delivered the messages of Jehovah to a benighted manhood, and opened to the eye of faith the dawn and noonday glory of a good time to come.

Jesus of Nazareth is a historical personage answering to the Messianic idea of the prophets, and also a personal centre from which flow the powers of history in the ages before, and that follow after His coming in the flesh. His life is a marvel from its beginning to its close. Born in a stable, laid in a manger, worshiped in that abode by the heavenly hosts and by the Magi, regarded as the son of a carpenter, poor and neglected, without wealth, position, or intellectual culture, such as the world is wont to honor—this is the beginning of His life, and so He continues until He reaches the age of thirty, and then He appears suddenly as a public teacher. From the start He causes wonder and surprise, by His wisdom and the authority of His manner. The multitudes follow and hear Him gladly. All are astounded at the miracles which He performs, and they begin to regard Him as the prophet that should come, and cherish the idea of proclaiming Him king. He takes no steps, however, to encourage any hopes of the kind, but with all the energy of His soul He devotes Himself to a mission that aimed at quite a different result. And, after a brilliant public career of a few years, He is taken by His enemies and condemned to die the ignominious death of the cross. And now His star went down under a cloud that no human eye could penetrate. Of all the sublime failures that mankind had ever witnessed, this was the most appalling. It was not like the fall of a planet that had been shining brightly with borrowed light, but like the ruin of a central sun, which, when it falls, drags with it into destruction the whole family hanging around it in the sidereal heavens.

The same sad fate came upon many of His early disciples. These were much like sheep without a shepherd, exposed to the ravages of hungry wolves. He, the Master, had chosen a small body of illiterate men to carry forword the work which He was come to fulfill, the scope of which embraced all the issues of history and reaches in its consequences the endless æons of eternity. If there is such a thing as organizing success, this certainly did not look much like it. The scheme is sublimely grand, but the agents chosen to carry it into effect are pitifully inadequate. What can these poor fishermen do to bring about anything that may claim the dignity of a grand world-revolution in any sense?

They are under a cloud and the band of persecution and of death is on them wherever they go; and as the Master laid down His life, so do they. Just as matters have come to this dark pass, Saul of Tarsus is joined to the little band of helpless followers, and he is better qualified for the great work of an Apostle. He entered upon his mission, and accomplished it with all the genius and energy of a master-workman. His apostolic career was a gigantic struggle from the beginning to the end, and at last he also went down into the shades of martyrdom. Again, we may say, what personal failures have we here, and how have fortune and success been wildly thrown away for the sake of an impracticable idea! But after the death of Jesus and His Apostles, the work of revolution, started on the shores of the sea of Galilee, began to triumph marvelously; the classic culture of Greece was forced to yield to the more celestial charms of the story of the Cross; and from thenceforth nations began to be joined together as one brotherhood, by the power of one faith, one hope, one baptism; and the apparent failure is turned into a historico-supernatural triumph, of the like of which all heathendom had never dreamt, and before which the master-pieces of oratory, of art, of philosophy, and of poetry, pale as do the dim shadows of the night before the splendor of the rising sun.

This rising economy, so strongly inaugurated, in the course of a few centuries becomes the central force of history. It takes hold of a state of society in which neither the personality and government of God, nor the dignity and destiny of man, are known and understood. This it undertakes to change radically and to usher in a new creation of the world, which was a task requiring no ordinary faith and means of success. It advanced ideas, grappled with institutions, changed manners and laws, and reformed customs. And after the rude hand of barbarism had scattered to the winds the broken fragments of classic civilization, this evangelic agency of the new economy stepped forward, took the reins, and confusion and violence gave way gradually to the behests of order and peace. Where lord and vassal lacked the power of social harmony and freedom; where security of life and property had not yet received the protection of just laws; where woman was the helpless victim of the stronger sex and where the family was not guarded by the sanctity of the marriage bond; where war was cruel, slavery held universal sway, and the future destiny of human kind was clouded in impenetrable darkness; there this God-sent evangel of the Christian faith brought hope, and light, and order, and progress, and peace. If we study modern society in its distinction from the social condition and political usages of antiquity, and examine into the character of the material out of which the present order of things was constructed, we would be dull indeed if the fact did not clearly present itself to our mind that no ordinary force has been at the bottom of historical processes since the commencement of our era. The personality of Jesus and the maxims of His gospel stand out in bold relief as the power behind the throne, by the benign sovereignty of which the blessings of social progress have come. In the mysterious progress of this heaven-descended power there are many and great individual and sectional failures; the ordinary causes of human events are not interfered with, but the final issues always tell the pleasing story of the more than human powers that have been at work. These powers we now see as behind the veil, coming to view only here and there in a tangible form; but we hope to see them in all their fulness from yonder battlements of heaven, when what now seem to be failures may shine forth as grand episodes of victory and success in the triumphal march of our great King.

Individuals grow small and insignificant in this broad objective movement. Many appear on the stage, and some will succeed and others will fail, as we take it. We may be able to account for the difference in a way satisfactory to our own minds, at least in some cases; yet much must remain a profound mystery until the final judgment day shall dawn upon the affairs of this present evil world. The primitive fathers, the master spirits of medieval Catholicism, and the princes and the rulers of the people, with the generations to which they respectively belong, come and go like so many actors in a great drama, not always meeting with a like fortune, but still moving in the same general current. The times change, and so do the features of individuals. Huss and Jerome of Prague, two bold and fearless apostles of reform, are burned as heretics; and one century later Luther and his contemporary reformers ride on in triumph, engaged in the same work in which their Bohemian predecessors had so signally failed. Evidently there is a striking difference here, and how may we know the reason? One hundred years may work a mighty revolution in popular opinions. The prejudices of to-day may strike a blow which those of to-morrow may have neither the will nor the power to strike. Since the days of the martyrs of Prague mighty strides have been made in religious opinions and political independence, and hence the Emperor Sigismund could barely allow what his successor on the throne, Charles V., found it good policy to deny. A current had now set in that swept over Europe, and that largely rearranged the relative order of things. Into this current the then king of England, though a moral monster and a rebel against the divine order of Christian civilization, could throw himself, and see himself victorious over the supremacy of the papal see. Thus goes the world, as we are sometimes led to think, without any restraint from a higher hand, and without any apparent distinction between the fortunes of the good and the evil; but when we understand that out of the ashes of the past there arises a state of things higher and better than that which went before, and that in this wise the world is drawing step by step nearer and nearer to the day of millennial peace, we cast our doubts to the winds and rest our hope upon the fact that there is a philosophy of success of which God is the author and Christ Jesus the historical vindicator.

The intellectual development of the race commenced quite early, and it is often claimed that it did not depend in any degree on the theological inspiration which so extensively affected all other departments of life. It may be granted that mental culture came by the force of natural powers, as did not the improvement of morals, the softening of manners, and the origin of institutions of charity. Greece and Rome had advanced far in the culture of the mind, long before the light of a true theology shone in upon them; but they never rose to either the morality or the charity of the gospel before the advent of the missionaries of the Cross. And the culture of these mighty nationalities, after all, was to a large extent religious. Socrates, who is justly regarded as the noblest genius of Pagan wisdom, was ruled in his thinking by religious ideas; and his last conversation with his friends and pupils, before he took the fatal cup, was on the immortality of the soul. Plato and Aristotle, both his pupils, caught his spirit; they both proved themselves masters in the abstract and physical sciences, and gained much of their immense power and influence by the religious ideas which ruled their thinking. They were indeed the gifted children of nature, men of the most comprehensive genius; and the classic productions of their mental calibre have stood the test of time and have become powerful auxiliaries of Christian thought. These will stand as sublime monuments of the highest order of intellectual greatness as long as the world shall last, and their educational influence will not cease as long as the grand models of the era to which they belong shall be studied. Indeed it would be somewhat difficult to find the exact intellectual peers of these two men; even the philosophical geniuses of modern Germany are not perhaps their absolute equals, and the world may well bow with profound reverence in the presence of such minds.

But it is not just in this upper stratum of the intellectual cosmos, that the most marked footprints of enlargement are found. The education of the masses, their social and intellectual improvement, is a matter of much more comprehensive significance than the appearance of a great mind here and there. The tendency and aim to realize this popular idea is peculiar to the Christian era, and belongs particularly to the generous movements of modern history. The growth of the movement is indeed slow, as all developments of the kind would naturally be under the same circumstances; but the elements of it are at hand from the beginning, and assert themselves more and more as time passes on. Classic culture lacked this element—it had not the true key to the dignity and destiny of the race, and hence it had not the power to reach the masses in the way of universal emancipation, as is now done by the culture of Christian nations. Circumstances, it must be allowed, had much to do with the failure of Pagan culture, as they had not the various agencies at command that we now have; but the main difference lies in fundamental principles. The ruling idea of Christian thinking has been all along that of a common origin, dignity, and destiny, of men. The missionary spirit of the Church rested on this assumption throughout the ages; and from this educational force has come the comprehensive generosity of modern educational measures. And any attempt to divest the progress of the mind from this, its normative force and character, with a view of asserting for the whole process a mere humanitarian or materialistic complexion, would be like tearing the warm, pulsating heart from its organic centre, and thus leaving the body a lifeless, ghastly corpse. At no period of history has it been possible to make an absolute separation of religion and the mind; nor will the time ever come, we dare say, judging simply from the wants and capacities common to all mankind, when science and theology may stand in deadly, uncompromising antagonism to each other without injury and harm. The secret of safety and success to the common interests of the race lies in a free, harmonious combination of these two factors, for the purpose of pushing forward the wheels of fortune with redoubled energy.

The inventive genius of modern times has added to our store not a few of the most powerful instrumentalities of success.

Among these the printing press, the application of steam as a motive power, and the magnetic telegraph, stand most prominent. These have become the agencies of a world of change in the social and commercial habits of the masses, and through them it was made possible to carry out the benevolent designs of the Gospel with ten-fold more rapidity and success. These are the means by which nations and communities are brought together, and are gradually drawn into the same current of thought and the same habits of life. Truly then our material progress is an element of success, and may claim an honorable position as a ruling factor in the philosophy of history; yet let us be careful that we understand its proper relations. It is no doubt highly significant that these inventions have all been made in the bosom of Christian nationalities, and that through them our civilization does now bear down on the Pagan civilizations of the world with a force that can not long be resisted. We know that the words of Jesus, "I am the life of the world," must not primarily be taken in a philosophical sense and as referring directly to the material, intellectual, or moral progress of the nations; but it has so happened that, ever since the inauguration of the Gospel economy, the main stream of history has been confined to Christian nations. And therefore, if we will not allow that Jesus, in His personality, life, and work, is the central life and power of all human progress, then it will be hard for us to find a reason for the state of things that has ruled the world for the last eighteen hundred years; yea, ever since the dawn of history.

But, again, we find it necessary to remind of the fact that there can be found nowhere anything like uninterrupted success, especially when this is made to have reference particularly to individual effort. In that sense we have failure on every hand and in every department of human existence. Even the classic era has its illustrious martyrs, and along the highway of material progress we find many sad spectacles of disappointed hopes and broken fortunes. We glory in our advanced ideas of education; we boast of our success in journalism and freedom of opinion; we sit comfortably in parlor-like coaches traveling on the great highways, and sail across the great deeps in magnificently furnished steamers; telegraphy brings us messages, with lightning speed, from all quarters—in a word, we are standing in the bosom of a most brilliant epoch of progress, which is simply the result of many trials and conflicts that have gone before. And do we ever think of the self-denying martyrs, the benefit of whose sacrifices we are now enjoying? These have been neglected, ridiculed, persecuted, put to death—many of them suffered hunger and privation for the sake of an idea, and perhaps at last went down into the grave broken-hearted, because in their day they could not realize their hopes. We now are enriched by their sufferings. Their works have resulted in a great success, but not for them. What after all would the world be if it were not for the men of one idea? If we had no martyrs, the precious seeds of progress would not be sown, society would remain stationary, and all would end in stagnation and death. A score of genuine martyrs, no matter in what sphere they may be found, are worth more to society than ten thousand bread-and-butter brigades who, in search after means for the gratification of the basilar passions of their nature, are marching up and down the avenues of life, flaunting the gaudy ensigns of a shallow secularism.

It must be borne in mind that we are discussing, not the art or policy of success, but the philosophy, which lies back of it as its proper historical basis and guarantee. The especial business with which we are concerned, accordingly, is to point out the general principles on which personal success generally depends, in order that these may be understood and turned to practical account. Hence we have but little to do with individuals, classes or parties; with money kings and merchant princes; with physicians, theologians, or politicians, mechanics or laborers, as regards any particular measures these may or ought to adopt to accomplish their personal ends. That matter may be safely left to private judgment, or to the established courses of well organized communities, when once the higher law of objective truths is rightly understood and respected. Yet individual activity must not be disregarded or ignored. In the economy of history there is nothing that may not be of vast account, and wealth, genius, enterprise, position, greatness and a thousand kindred interests, must not be treated as insignificant, useless or wrong; but as fruits rather that flow legitimately from a healthy state of society, and help to sustain it in return. If individual enterprise were not encouraged and protected, if it were not sustained by the authority of the law and an intelligent public opinion, there could be no public or private prosperity:—as it was, for instance, after the downfall of the Roman Empire, when a flood of barbarism swept ruthlessly over the classic soil of a broken civilization; when horde was against horde, or feudal lord against feudal lord; when every house had to be constructed with a view to defence against freebooters and marauders; in a word, when there was no security of property and life, and the most beautiful regions of country were utterly devastated and ruined, simply because there was no civil authority to maintain order and peace. Under such a state of affairs our own fair land, with all its material improvements and boundless resources, would soon be turned into a howling wilderness. But still the wreck of fortune does not lie altogether in the direction of lawlessness and political chaos; individual enterprise may be crushed out and prosperity prevented by the want of freedom and the enforcement of unjust laws, and hence ruin may come from the bosom of a blind and arbitrary conservatism. To move forever in fixed ruts, without any freedom of either thought or action, is to sap the foundations of prosperity as effectually in the end as it is done by running the body politic into a Bedlam of civil and social confusion. The secret of success evidently lies in the union of authority and freedom, ruled by a rational sense of general good. Wherever these two factors are harmoniously joined together, even the wilderness and the solitary places are made glad, and the desert may blossom as a rose.

But there is a lion in the way—all matters are involved in difficulty, and it would be strange indeed if an economy so complicated as that of the social order should not be encumbered with troubles on every hand. The alarm of dangers ahead is frequently sounded—corruption is polluting the land; the foundations of liberty are threatened; shallow coxcombs and vaunting demagogues ride into prominence and power and rule the day, while men of culture, ability and character are passed by or stand aloof in disgust. If this downward tendency cannot be stopped, what will become of the Republic? what of our liberties? what of the success and prosperity of this great nation? These are solemn questions, and it would be madness to thrust them aside as of no account. They must be answered, and the issue involved in them must be met; and we can see no other way of doing this successfully than by returning to first principles. These are well defined in the history, the common law, of the Christian world; they have been proclaimed by Apostles and prophets, and they are deeply imbedded in the consciousness of all communities where the love of Christ is not waxing cold. Apart, however, from every consideration of a selfish or secular character, these conflicts and troubles of earth are no doubt a part of a beneficent scheme, the blessed workings and aims of which we may be permitted even here to see in part; but the full scope of which we shall only be able to understand when we come to judge them amid the celestial realities of a better world. Many a great soul would remain unnoticed and unfelt, if sorrow and affliction did not wring from it thoughts and deeds that would otherwise never come to light; and not a few of those who occupy prominent positions would not have reached them if it had not been for the misfortunes of the hour. If such is our experience here below, where we see things but dimly as in a glass, how will it be where we shall apprehend all things as we are apprehended? May we not there perhaps understand the awful mystery of evil, as a blessing in disguise to all them that are saved? Yet, let us not attempt to lift the veil now, but rather let us wait patiently for the coming of Him who will lift it in His own good time. Meanwhile, however, it is our high calling to look carefully into the mysteries of God's providential care and direction, so that when the grand final day shall dawn upon us we may be fully awake to its demands.

And now, then, what are the prospects of the coming of a millennium of universal good will, prosperity, and peace? Any one not endowed with the same power by which this prophecy was originally made, must be satisfied to draw conclusions from what has already happened in fulfillment of the same, as an answer to this inquiry.

Isaiah, the great master-spirit of Hebrew prophecy, declared that, at the coming of this era, nations would gladly cast their idols to the moles and the bats. It must be remembered that this was spoken centuries before the sculptors and architects of Greece and Rome had erected their magnificent piles to the honor of the gods, and before idolatry had received the support of the most consummate display of genius the world ever produced. The holy seer stood in the midst of universal Pagan ignorance, with long ages of idolatrous superstition yet to come staring him in the face, when he sang joyfully of the good time to come. He did not therefore draw his information from the condition of things around him; he claimed to judge in the case by quite another rule, and to base his judgment on quite a different authority. As unlikely as it appeared, however, his prediction has had the good fortune of being met most marvelously by the tendencies of the ages, and we now have the very best reasons to accept his deliverance as a statement of a well authenticated fact. And if he erred not in this one thing so improbable, it must be very evident that he had a key to the secrets and glories of the future which all the world besides, not standing in the same divine order and favor in which he stood, did not possess. And if he knew how idols would be cast away, and how the temples of the gods would be turned into sanctuaries of a better worship, we may well believe that he was enabled to look somewhat further into the nature and results of this grand revolution, and that he could tell of the social bliss and harmony that would flow from it. In view of this fact, we may say that it is altogether likely that this prophecy will be fulfilled to the very letter, in a manner and in such time as the wisdom of God will direct.

But this same seer also prophesied that the nations would do one other thing, which is yet not so apparent—*beat their swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks, and make war no more.* Nearly three thousand years have come and gone, and this blessed evangel has not been realized. It is a lesson hard to learn, and the world comes to it slowly, if it ever will. And, after all, matters seem to tend in this direction. Time was when war was more cruel; when it was not accompanied by commissary and sanitary regulations; and when, there being no exchange of prisoners, these were either reduced to slavery or butchered wholesale. Modern civilization, with all its gigantic war measures and standing armies, is far more humane, and in this lies the hope, nay, the guarantee that the day is approaching when reason will have sway of the passions in such measure as will stop the sanguinary scenes of the battle-field, and put an end to armies and implements of war. If the nations have been led to break the bonds of slavery and to lift up the weaker sex to its proper dignity and position, it would be singular if, in the course of time, they could not rise to the divine sentiment of universal harmony and peace. And if any one should remind us here of the belligerent attitude of the civilized world, and of the perpetual war rumors that greet us from evey quarter, we will take the liberty to point him in return to the surroundings of Isaiah and the look-out of his day, taken in connection with the historical solution that has since been made to follow. The philosophy of Christian civilization looks infallibly in this direction of fulfillment, and that is sufficient.

Jesus Christ instructed his disciples to remain at Jerusalem until He should endow them with power from on high, and then they should go forth to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins to the ends of the earth. There never was anything more unlikely than that this missionary scheme could be carried into effect, and especially that the results would come from it that were promised. That such a movement should start in an obscure corner of the world and be successfully carried through, by such means, under such circumstances, would have been regarded by every one not in the spirit of the movement itself as an absolute impossibility. But the work commenced, and how it succeeded we need not tell. Enough that it has proved a great success, especially in the creation of a public beneficence that aims at becoming world-embracing in its effects. It is this genius of good will to men that rules in the gospel and that has embodied itself in the institutions of our era, that forms the burden of prophetic song and that gives undoubted certainty to the fulfillment of the promise of universal redemption. And thus we see that the voice of the ancient prophets and the testimony of Jesus coincide, making it doubly sure that what has been spoken will come to pass. But here, again, the logic of figures seems to be against our hope, since the number that still go after idols is much greater than that of those who follow Christ. The fact of mere numbers is, however, no appalling argument on the arena of moral force; the besotted nationalities of modern heathendom are no match for the cosmopolitan tendencies of European ideas; and the day seems to be near at hand when oriental castes and Chinese prejudice will be removed by the irresistible progress of Christian institutions, laws and usages. In politics, religion, social morality and happiness, and in intellectual activity and culture, the great Caucasian race is broadly in the ascendant, and the chances, notwithstanding the lack of numerical superiority or equality, are positively in favor of the powers who are marching under the banner of the cross and are enforcing the maxims of the everlasting Gospel of Peace.

Such are the arguments in favor of a coming millennium, drawn from the voice of prophecy as re-echoed by the voice of history, and sustained by the personality of Jesus and His historical supremacy. As we have said before, the whole process is distinctly theological in its fundamental laws, and its roots lie far beyond what is seen and known of men; and yet so penetrating are its genius and life that no secular or material interests can escape from its controlling power. The secular world is compelled to enter its service, directly or indirectly, and to do the bidding of its laws in the fulfillment of its mission, even where there is a disposition to insist on and glory in absolute independency. And in this fact lies a powerful argument in favor of our millennial hopes and expectations. The printing press is a great power, and we are aware that this power is wielded extensively in a manner hostile to the true genius of our civilization; in spite of this evil, however, the press is a mighty auxiliary of legitimate progress and the growth of Christian ideas. Our modern systems of intellectual culture have become the nurseries of the highest and most comprehensive order of intellectual strength and capacity, much of which is also indifferent or unfriendly to the specific claims of Christian life; yet the culture and mental force of modern society can never divest itself from the supremacy of the cardinal principles which now rule the social order without ruin, and hence the boldest infidelity is time and again forced back into the service of our civilization. And now come our railroads and the whole family of material improvements, and by these we can bring the people together on a scale such as the world did not dream of even a century ago, and we can more easily get them to adopt the same ideas and manners. By these means and instrumentalities we can also carry into effect the benevolent aims and impulses of our times, with an intensity and quickness which have no parallel, even in the previous ages of our era. Hence we see the secular world either willingly or unwillingly, intelligently or blindly, is coming up to the help of the Lord against the benighted powers that are yet beyond the reach of Christian ideas.

The salt of the earth and the light of the world, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, are still to be found where the Lord has declared them to be. This is the foundation which the Lord has laid, and on which Apostles and prophets have built; all builders who attempt to raise up a structure on any other foundation, will have shame and confusion for their reward. Hence the philosophy of success, in its broadest sense, is only found in the order of the Christian life, as this started in Christ, was promulgated by the Apostles, maintained and developed by the Church through the ages, and now rules the economy of our civilization. "Oh, that men would praise the Lord for His goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men!"

EDITORIAL NOTES AND ITEMS.

In the absence of any department for this purpose in the body of the REVIEW, we connect with our book-notices some notes on topics connected with the periodical religious literature of the day.

The Office of Faith and the Means of Grace.

The *Christian World*, one hemisphere of it especially, has been trying for some time to prove that it is through *faith* alone that we are united to Christ and partake of all His benefits. This proposition is placed by the editor in opposition to the proposition that we are united to Christ and partake of His benefits also through the *sacraments.* The antithesis in the time of the Reformation, however, was between faith and works, not between faith and the sacraments. Let us see how this matter stands.

In the first place we believe, with the editor of the *Christian World*, that it is through faith on our part that the blessings of salvation are received. Faith is the spiritual organ for their reception.

But it is very evident that faith itself is not the union with Christ, nor the reception of His benefits, nor can it of itself effect this union. Salvation must be offered to man, must confront him, in order that he may receive it. How is Christ offered for our faith? Evidently through the Gospel. And the Gospel includes the Word and the Sacraments. We are not to take the one without the other. Each has its specific office. We need not stop to define their difference. Now in baptism there is a presentation of grace to the believer, or the child of the believer. He accepts the grace through faith. Is it not plain now that to hold up faith as man's act to the disparagement of God's act, which is His holy baptism, is to pervert the truth of the Scriptures?

Faith is not to be set over against the Word or the Sacrament.s The one is the means or medium of God's approach to us, the other man's response. All this effort, therefore, to show that because we receive the benefits of Christ by faith, and therefore it is not through the sacraments that any grace is received, is presenting a false antithesis, and proves nothing.

Dr. Schaff on Infant Salvation.

Some time ago Dr. Schaff published an article in the *Indepen-*

dent purporting to be, in some sort, a defence of Dr. Hodge against an article on this subject in this REVIEW by Dr. C. P. Krauth. Dr. Schaff acknowledges that Dr. Krauth is right as against Dr. Hodge when he says, "He" (Dr. Krauth) "shows conclusively that some (all?) eminent Calvinistic divines" (Dr. Hodge said he did not know any) "while conceding always the salvation of *elect* infants, either virtually imply or expressly teach that there are *reprobates* among infants, as well as adults, and that these reprobate infants, dying in infancy, are eternally lost." Also when he says: "Both Dr. Hodge and. Dr. Krauth, in the milder view which they advocate, *depart from the orthodoxy* of their respective Churches, as it prevailed during the seventeenth century." Calvinism then must have undergone a change, which Dr. Hodge does not like to allow, or else Dr. Hodge is not orthodox. Whether Dr. Krauth is orthodox on this point, according to the teaching of the Lutheran Church, he can answer for himself. That has nothing to do, however, with his argument against Dr. Hodge.

Dr. Schaff then goes on to give his view in regard to infant salvation. His conclusion is that all infants of Christian parents are *certainly* saved, since the covenant blessing extends to whole families, and that all other children dying in infancy may be presumed to be saved, for certain reasons which he gives. That is, we suppose, as Dr. Schaff used to state it, the salvation of infants of Christian parents is an article of *faith*, and of other infants, dying in infancy, an article of *hope*. This is as far as Dr. Schaff ventures to go.

The *Christian World* publishes this article of Dr. Schaff as a reply to Dr. Krauth in the MERCERSBURG REVIEW, and thinks Dr. Schaff has made the matter clear to the comprehension of all. We do not see that he has made anything clear, except that he thinks Lutheran theology is involved in difficulty here as well as the Calvanistic. The subject of infant salvation is not so easily made clear, and leaves room for more to be written upon it after Dr. Schaff's article.

Carrying up Appeals to the General Synod.

In reading the proceedings of the General Assembly at Cleveland, we notice that all the appeal cases come first before the Judicial Committee, and this committee reports recommendations in regard to them. All the appeal cases, of which there was a number, were disposed of by adopting the recommendations of this committee, and thus none came before the Assembly. Perhaps such a committee would perform a good office in our General Synod. It happened that we did as well at Fort Wayne, for all the appeal cases there were settled by the attorneys appointed to conduct the cases. A Judicial Committee, with powers to decide in the cases, subject, however, to the decision of the General Synod, might save a great deal of time and trouble.

The Presbyterian Church and the Apostles' Creed.

The Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church asked permission of the General Assembly to strike out the article, "He descended into hell," from the Creed in their publications, on the ground that it conveys to multitudes a false idea. The committee, through its Chairman, Dr. George C. Heckman, reported that "the proposed change involves a corresponding change in the standards of the Church, and therefore they reply that it is inexpedient." A minority report recommended the omission, and the whole subject was thereupon laid on the table.

When the Apostles' Creed comes to be changed or amended, the Reformation confessions and catechisms will have to be changed and amended as well, for they pretty much all, if not indeed all, adopt it.

The Validity of Roman Catholic Baptism.

This subject was again before the General Assembly, and the decision was "that the decision of the question be left to the judgment of each Church session, guided by the principles governing the subject of baptism as laid down in the standards of our Church."

If that means that those standards give a clear answer, then the Presbytery of Genesee was hardly justified in sending up the overture. Or does it mean that the assembly itself was not in the clear as to what those standards decided on this subject, and so got over the matter in the easiest way? We should think there ought to be no difficulty in answering the question in the affirmative, that Roman Catholic baptism is valid. Roman Catholics, we know, hold that Protestant baptism is valid. Wherever baptism is *Christian*, it ought to be acknowledged as valid.

The Dutch Reformed General Synod.

The delegate from this body to our German Reformed General Synod, seems to have been somewhat disturbed by the discussions at Fort Wayne, for he is said, in the New York papers, to have reported back to his synod at Jersey City that the differences between the East and the West in our Church are so great that there is no hope of our remaining united. If he had been present at some of our other General Synods, he would have been still more puzzled to know how we have continued united so long. And if he had remained to the close of the sessions at Fort Wayne he would have, perhaps, arrived at a different conclusion. The first few days were stormy, but the later sessions were remarkably unanimous. We are used to a good deal of discussion in our Church, but we go on united nevertheless.

We see it now stated that the synod amended the report of the delegate so as to leave out this reference to the prospect of division in our Church. We think that was wise.

The Report on Public Theological Teaching in the Reformed Church adopted at Fort Wayne.

What does that report mean?

I. It asserts "that according to the clear provision of the Constitution of the Church, all public theological teaching within the bounds of any particular synod, is placed exclusively under the control of that district synod." This is the resolution adopted, and it was adopted in response to the overture from the Pittsburg Synod, asking that the district synods may be protected in their absolute control over public theological teaching within their bounds. This is certainly clear.

But, now, the General Synod at Cincinnati had taken action contrary to this by declaring that the theological teaching at Ursinus College, which is not under synodical control, is not unconstitutional —a decision which referred only to that particular case. What now was to be the effect of this new decision on the former one? Would it *reverse* that? The answer was, no; there should be no *ex post facto* legislation. That case was decided, and that decision stands so long as the teaching at Ursinus is not brought up for decision in a new case, which, it was stated, the friends of order do not contemplate doing.

But neither does the report mean to *affirm* that decision, so as to make a decision, either expressly or implicitly, in favor of the regularity of the teaching at Ursinus. By not interfering with the decision at Cincinnati, the report does not mean to imply at all that that decision was right. It simply says it has legal force. Hence,

II. It was resolved that the former resolution is designed neither to *reverse* nor *affirm* the decision at Cincinnati in the Super appeal case.

The action looks to the future. If the General Synod once allowed certain theological teaching to go forward independent of synodical supervision and control, such permission is not to be given any more. This is our reply, in addition to what we have said elsewhere, to Dr. Bomberger's long and labored argument, in which he attempts to make out that this action at Fort Wayne, by some inconsistency or contradiction, endorses the constitutionality of the theological teaching at Ursinus. It does no such thing, as any one can see who will interpret it fairly.

Dr. Bomberger puts in italics the statement that the senior editor of this REVIEW was at the meeting of the Pittsburg Synod which adopted the overture sent to Fort Wayne on this subject, and adds: "Whether he was consulted by the committee in the preparation of the paper, or had any hand in it, we are, of course, unable to say. But, under the circumstances, it is significant that he was there."

There is an insinuation here that we may have had something to do with that overture. Now we inform Dr. Bomberger that we attended the Pittsburg Synod for an entirely different object; that we were not present when the report of Dr. Russell was made; that we were not consulted by the committee nor had any hand in the preparation of their report. As Dr. Bomberger professes to give the truth, he will, of course, publish this statement, and thus correct any wrong inference his readers may have drawn from his former statement.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND NATIONAL ECONOMY. By Robert Ellis Thompson, M. A., Professor of Social Science in the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1875.

In the opening of this volume the author gives a sketch of the history of the science, and of the different schools by which it has been treated—the *Mercantile* school, the *Economistes* or *Physiocrates*, and the *Industrial* school. He then gives a chapter on the development of society, the nation. The view here set forth is, in the main, correct. A nation is, like the family, an organism, not an accretion. Moreover, it is of divine origin. "The State is either the creature of God, with authority limited because delegated, or is an uncreated entity, with authority unlimited because original. In the latter case it can confess none of its acts to be wrongful, since it owns no law or morality beyond its own will." This is right, yet the origin of the State from God must not be viewed as external, so as to justify the theory of "the divine right of kings," which is often abused in favor of arbitrary power.

The main portion of the work is occupied in considering the subject of national economy. The subject of national education receives some attention at the close of the volume.

We think the additional title, *Social Science*, is hardly appropriate to the book. National Economy would be sufficient. We cannot see, however, why works of this kind might not embrace a treatment of the nature and functions of the State in a wider view. Social economy, as pertaining to the development and preservation of wealth, is certainly important. It furnishes a very necessary physical basis for higher development in culture and morality ; but the subjects of education, morality and religion ought not to be omitted.

This author, as we have seen, does treat briefly of the subject of national education. But on jurisprudence, morality and religion, he is silent, except scattered remarks throughout the volume. The kind of use to which he would have the Bible applied in our public schools, to our mind, is questionable. He would have the Old Testament used as a text-book to inculcate the principles of national calling and national righteousness, and so also portions of the New Testament, as the sermon on the mount. How far the Bible might be lowered in this way into mere natural religion and natural morality, would be a serious question. It was given, not to the world, but to a chosen people. It contains a sacred revelation, addressed to faith, and to be guarded from profane use. The State cannot teach the Bible. This belongs to the Church.

And here comes, then, at once the relation of Church and State, which, we think, would be a fair topic for treatment in political science. This subject is growing in importance in this country. We start here with the theory of separation between Church and State, and yet the two must be closely related, and the older our nation becomes, the more will these relations have to be carefully considered.

The work here noticed is published in fine style, and is well adapted in its arrangement for use in the class room.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS; Or, The True Moral Manhood and Life of Duty. A Text-Book for Schools and Colleges. By D. S. Gregory, D. D., Professor of Moral Science, Logic, and Metaphysics in the University of Wooster. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother, 17 North Seventh street. 1875.

We are not prepared, without more thorough examination, and a more extensive treatment of the general subject than the character of these book notices allows, to present anything like a satisfactory criticism of this work. The subject itself is exceedingly difficult. We feel in looking over this work that the author has hardly realized the difficulty and magnitude of his undertaking. In one point of view the work is somewhat successful, viz: taking the points introduced as already settled by others, the author has placed the conclusions and definitions in convenient order for the student. But the almost endless number of short paragraphs and definitions is rather confusing to the educated mind, which seeks to lay hold of general principles and leading thoughts, under which then the details will easily arrange themselves.

We may refer to a few points in the author's treatment of moral freedom to indicate somewhat the character of the work. Under the heading, TRUTH OF FREEDOM, we have certain *propositions.*

"Proposition 1st. True freedom is not inconsistent with human dependence and limitation." This is correct.

"Proposition 2d. True freedom in action, while not consistent with necessity, is nevertheless not inconsistent with certainty."

In this proposition the author evidently means by necessity—constraint by a foreign force or power. But then we get no conception of internal necessity, which is a necessary element of moral freedom. Necessity must become an element of the good will. Without a proper understanding of this point the nature of moral freedom cannot be properly understood.

"Proposition 3d. In general, man's action is free, when, within his own proper sphere of action, he can will just what he pleases."

By freedom here again is meant the power of choice. But this gives us a very poor idea of freedom. It is hardly anything above what some animals possess. If it always pleases a man to will what is right, then, and then only, is he free when he wills just what he pleases.

In the closing chapter, covering what are usually denominated *duties to God*, there is a sort of revealed religion implied without Christianity. The words Christ and Christianity are several times used, but even then with no real necessity or significance. Worship of God, according to the author, resolves itself into two things: The duty of prayer, and the duty of Sabbath observance. That is a rather meagre conception of worship.

We can see little or no significance anywhere in the work of the word *Christian* in the title of the book, for there is no Christ in it, in any truly scientific sense. The author thinks, as he says, that there is room for a system of *Christian Ethics,* as distinguished on the one side from Natural Ethics, and on the other from Theological Ethics. But in attempting to give a system of *Christian* Ethics, the author has no real recognition of Christ as the principle, in any sense, of his system.

The work is prepared in the fine style for which the publishing house of Eldredge & Bro. has become known. In this respect it is all that could be desired.

THE BREMEN LECTURES, ON FUNDAMENTAL, LIVING, RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS. By various European Divines. Translated from the original German, by Rev. D. Heagle. With an Introduction, by Alvah Hovey, D. D., President of Newton Theological Institution. Second edition, enlarged and improved. Boston: Published by D. Lothrop & Co. Dover, N. H.: G. T. Day & Co.

Lecture I. The Biblical Conception of God. By Theodore Christlieb, D. D., University Preacher and Professor of Theology at Bonn.

Lecture II. The Doctrines of Creation and Natural Science. By Otto Zöckler, D. D., Professor at Greifswald.

Lecture III. Reason, Conscience, and Revelation. By Hermann Cremer, D. D., Professor of Theology at Greifswald.

Lecture IV. Miracles. By Rev. M. Fuchs, Pastor at Oppin, near Halle.

Lecture V. The Person of Jesus Christ By Chr. E. Luthardt, D. D., Professor of Theology at Leipsic.

Lecture VI. The Resurrection of Christ, as a Soteriogico-Historical Fact. By Gerhard Uhlhorn, D. D., first preacher to the (late) Count of Hanover.

Lecture VII. The Scriptural Doctrine of Atonement. By W. F. Gess, D. D., Professor at Gottingen.

Lecture VIII. The Authenticity of our Gospels. By Constantine Tischendorf, D. D., Professor of Theology at Leipsic.

Lecture IX. The Idea of the Kingdom of God as Consummated, and what it tells us regarding Historical Christianity. By J. P. Lange, D. D., Professor at Bonn.

Lecture X. Christianity and Culture. By Rev. Julius Disselhoff, Pastor and Inspector in Kaiserswerth.

This is a volume of 358 pages. We give the contents, as sufficient to arrest the attention and enlist the interest of the readers of the REVIEW. It gives some of the best results of German theological learning and piety. It is popular in style, and strikes at the rationalism of the age. It will repay careful reading.

THE SERVICE OF PRAISE; or, Hymns and Tunes and Scripture Lessons. Arranged for Praise Meetings and Public Worship. By Rev. Wm. T. Eustis, Springfield, Mass. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1875. For sale by Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, Pa., and by Edwards & Bishop, Lancaster, Pa.

This is a beautiful volume, and if we in the Reformed Church are to have a hymn book, with the music set to the hymns, we would recommend this as a model, in the form in which it is published. The Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed are on the first page. There are presented several *Orders of Public Worship*, a Morning Service, Afternoon and Evening Service, the Service of the Holy Communion, Baptism of Children, and Funeral Service. Then we have the Apostolic Benediction and Doxologies, after which the hymn-book proper begins, containing about 400 hymns set on one page and the music opposite. After this are selections for chanting, and lastly Scripture Lessons to be read alternately by minister and people.

This is a Liturgy for the Congregational Church in Puritan New England. The *Order of Worship* is taken from those now used in several Congregational Churches. Similar forms are no doubt in use in many others. The idea of a liturgy for public worship is pressing itself for consideration in all directions. There are principles and laws of public worship which cannot be disregarded without doing violence to the service of praise, as it is here called. Especially is the feature of the people taking part in the worship commending itself very generally now in the Churches. When this feature is generally received, the opposition to responses must disappear. This opposition, so far as it bears, not against the kind or number of responses (for here there may be intelligent difference of opinion), but against the idea of any response, is based certainly upon prejudice. Antiphonal reading of Scripture is responsive service, and yet this is becoming almost universal.

THE SYNOD OF OHIO. We have just received (June 25th) a copy of the proceedings of the Ohio Synod, which met at Miamisburg, Montgomery county Ohio, April 21st, 1875. There were present *twenty-two* ministers and *eight* elders, in all *thirty* members. The usual business was transacted and the Synod adjourned on the 26th of April, after being in session nearly five days.

According to the statistics the Ohio Synod is divided into *thirteen* Classes and has on its roll 148 ministers, and reports 23,345 members. Two new Classes were organized during the year, the Cincinnati (German) and the Kansas Classis, the former with *six* ministers and the latter with *four*. Two, Ursinus and St. John's, were dismissed to the Synod of the Northwest. The Synod of Ohio has a larger number of Classes than any other Synod in the Church. The Synod of the U. S., for instance, has but *eight* Classes with a membership of 63,116, and the Potomac Synod *six*, with a membership of 25,108. Of course some of these Classes contain a very small membership. Kansas has a membership of 331; Ursinus, 522; Shelby, 407; Northern Illinois, 410; each about as large in membership as one ordinary congregation in the Eastern Synod. The largest, the Miami, contains 3,943 members. These smaller Classes are, to a large extent, missionary Classes, and may be expected to increase with considerable rapidity.

The income for the Theological Seminary at Tiffin, including interest and collections for the year, amounted to $1,704.00. This seems to indicate a very inadequate endowment; and as much of the interest consists of small sums, from $3 up to $25, there is some danger, we should think, that in the course of years much of this portion of the endowment will be lost, as was the case with our Plainfield bonds in the east

For Beneficiary Education there is reported $959.33, which was distributed among 14 beneficiary students. This seems a small sum for this important interest. It would not average *seven* dollars to a minister or charge. If we are not mistaken the Mercersburg Classis raises more than this yearly.

The endowment of the college at Tiffin is not given, nor the income for the year. The outlay for the current year, however, is given as about $5,000, which the Board of Trustees expects to be able to meet by the close of the year. The Financial Agent, Elder Henry Leonard, was not very successful during the last year. He reports having collected $124.06, while his expenses were $193 01, leaving a balance due the agent of $68.95. Along with this, however, he collected on old notes and interest, $1,093.70. There must be a considerable portion of the endowment of Heidelberg College invested in small notes in the hands of private individuals. The sooner this is collected and invested in a different form, the better it will be for the college. Experience has proved, we think, that *five* dollars collected in *cash* is better than *ten* in the way of *note*. The college is reported as being in a flourishing condition, and exerting a salutary influence for the Church.

The amount collected for missions during the last year was $2,450.65, which is a slight increase on the previous year. It seems that, for some reason or other, this Synod took a new start in raising missionary funds about the year 1872. In 1870 it is reported as raising only $381.04; in 1871–2, $857.50. Then it rose at once to $2,050.50, and has been slowly increasing the amount each year since. This amount is encouraging, but it seems small comcompared with the great need. There are some twenty-five or twenty-six mission stations under the care of this Synod, and the Board of Missions report a debt of $1,400. Our whole church, east and west, needs a thorough revival on the subject of missions.

It would seem that liturgy-making in the west is not a very profitable business. The first edition of the English Liturgy, it would seem, did not find a very ready sale. Dr. Williard reports reports that "the publisher had too large an edition printed in the start, and put the wholesale price too low, according to the price of publication." A second edition, *with family prayers* added, has been published, however, and this is contributing greatly to its sale. The Liturgy has not as yet paid for itself, but has a debt of

$354 resting upon it. "As an offset to this there are books in the hands of ministers" (better, no doubt, if some of them, at least, were in the hands of members) "to the amount of $200, and a sufficient number *still on hand* to pay the balance of the debt." Their being still on hand, however, gives poor promise of paying the debt.

The publication of the German Liturgy has involved a debt of $652.28, over three-fourths of the whole cost. But few can have been sold. Still it must be remembered that the German Liturgy has not been long before the public.

This item on the Western Liturgy is suggestive. It has been given out by certain parties that *the people* do not want the Eastern Liturgy, the Order of Worship; that *they* would not have it, whatever the ministers might want. This has been reiterated, over and over again, and used on all occasions as a kind of party watchword. Give *the people* the right kind of a Liturgy, and see how they will take it, and take to it also. Well, now, here is a Liturgy which these parties have framed just to their idea, and yet hardly can they get *one edition* off their hands, while *The Order of Worship* was going out in its *seventh* edition already in 1871, the date of the one we happen to have now at hand! These *figures* tell a different story. One reason, no doubt, is because the Western Liturgy is not a people's Liturgy, while the Order of Worship is. But whatever the reason, it cannot be said truthfully that the people do not want the Order of Worship.

There are several other items we might notice in these proceedings, but we pass them by now. We merely refer yet to a notice of these proceedings in an article by Dr. G. W. Williard, President of Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio. He says: "Those who have observed the meetings of this Synod (Ohio) have seen the remarkable unity with which it has been characterized. This is what might have been expected in view of the influence of Heidelberg College and Seminary, located within its bounds. As is known, these institutions have strenuously maintained the old faith and customs of the Church, in opposition to the innovations that have been introduced within the last twenty years. They have laid no claims to any new philosophy or theology; but have sought in an humble and earnest way to bring out more fully to the consciousness of the Church her true doctrinal position, life, spirit, and mission."

We cannot just see how it reflects any special credit on the learned professors at Tiffin, for whom Dr. Williard here speaks, that for twenty years they have brought out nothing new in philosophy or theology; for these both are progressive sciences, and the last quarter of a century has been very stirring and progressive in all departments of science. Nor are we acquainted with any writings in which they have particularly distinguished themselves above their brethren in other institutions in the Church, in "bringing out more fully to the consciousness of the Church her true doctrinal position, life, spirit and mission." If they have done so, however, we certainly rejoice in their work, and hope their activity in this direction may serve to inspire the professors in our other colleges and seminaries with a like scholarly activity. Certainly that is what these institutions are for, and we must commend what is here claimed for the professional superiority of the Tiffin professors to the attention of our professors elsewhere.

We rejoice in the growth and prosperity of the Ohio Synod, and wish it much success in the future. There is great room for increased activity and liberality in all our Synods.

BINNEY'S THEOLOGICAL COMPEND IMPROVED. Containing a Synopsis of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals, and Institutions of Christianity. Designed for Bible Classes, Theological Students, and young Preachers. By Rev. Amos Binney and Rev. Daniel Steele, D. D. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1875.

OUR KING AND SAVIOUR; or, The Story of Our Lord's Life on Earth, etc., for Young Persons and General Readers. By Daniel Wise, D. D. With Eighty-three Illustrations. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. Sunday-school Department.

LOVE ENTHRONED: Essays on Evangelical Perfection. By Daniel Steele, D. D. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1875.

OUTLINES OF CHURCH HISTORY. By John F. Hurst. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1875.

We have space now only to give the titles of the above works. They are published in very fine and attractive style. The Life of Our Lord is especially fine. This, and the Outlines of Church History, and Binney's Theological Compend, are adapted to teachers and advanced classes in Sunday-schools, as well as for the general reader. The above works are all for sale by PERKINPINE & HIGGINS, 830 Arch street, Philadelphia.

Several notices are left out for want of room.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1875.

ART. I.—DR. BUSH ON THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M., MONT ALTO, PA.

The preparation of this article was suggested by the re-reading of a somewhat remarkable production, entitled "Anastasis; or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead," by the late Rev. Dr. Bush, Professor of Hebrew in the New York City University. The fact that this work was written and given to the public some thirty years ago, might seem to render a notice of it inappropriate. The work, however, is of such a character as eminently to merit attention; and the circumstance that of late the name of the sainted author has become somewhat prominently associated with that of the eccentric, but learned and genial Baron Swedenborg, may serve as an additional inducement to take up the general subject of the resurrection in connection with the work referred to above. We may also further state that the author once occupied a prominent position in the American Church, as Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature in one of its oldest and most renowned institutions. He was, besides, very favorably known as the author of a number of learned and popular works, such as his "Notes" on the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and other books of the Bible, "Illustrations of the Holy Scriptures," the "Hierophant," and other like productions.

The particular work which we propose to make the basis of some friendly criticisms, is, beyond all question, an able and interesting production. The subject itself is of prime importance to the Church of Christ, and the antagonistic position which the work occupies, relative to the commonly received opinions and established views of the Christian public, renders it eminently worthy of notice. Whatever may be thought of the general doctrine propounded in the book, and of the peculiar sentiments advanced and strenuously advocated, by the sainted author, surely no one can think lightly either of the subject itself, or of the very able and interesting manner in which the subject is treated. The author's ability and thorough scholarship are undoubted; and the earnest and amiable spirit which characterizes the discussion is worthy of the highest regard. He is also equally honest and open-hearted. He does not wish to shirk the solemn responsibility which the task involves, nor does he attempt to conceal the real question at issue, or seek to gain his point under cover of unfair and delusive statements. Already in the Preface to the book he announces clearly and distinctly the divergent conclusions to which the course of his peculiar reasoning conducts him, and he hesitates not to confess that these conclusions are utterly and irreconcilably at variance with the commonly received opinions in regard to the subject under discussion. On this point we cite the following passage: "It is certain that the conclusions to which I have arrived, and which will be found embodied in the ensuing pages, must, if built upon sound premises, present the grand future under an entirely new aspect. The resurrection of the body, if my reasonings and expositions are well-founded, is not a doctrine of revelation." (P. 3.)

Dr. Bush keenly feels the solemnity of this announcement, and is fully aware of the shock which it must produce on the minds of those whose cherished and consoling views are thus openly assailed; and, in the way of justifying his course, and obviating the charge of rudeness, he says: "If anything can be cited in the way of apology for thus going against the prevalent views of the Christian world on an important point of doctrine, it is the establishment of the principle, maintained in my introduction, of the *pro-*

gressive development of Scriptural truth. This principle I believe to be a sound one, and under its tutelage my conclusions must take shelter." The author's conviction of the soundness of his position, as well as the legitimacy and practical importance of his conclusions, appears to be strong and decided. Hence he immediately adds: "On a candid review of the whole subject, I cannot divest myself of the impression that both my premises and my conclusions are sound. If so, let it not be thought strange that my solicitude for the result embraces my readers as well as myself. Truth has the same claims upon them that it has upon me. As it must be necessarily a matter of serious moment with me to propagate that which is false, so it cannot be a thing of light import with them to reject that which is true. * * * No candid mind, therefore, can fail to appreciate the earnestness with which I enter my protest against the hasty verdict of mere prejudice and preconception. Putting, as I do, everything at stake on the score of reputation, influence, usefulness, and temporal well-being, I feel that I have a right to be heard in defense of conclusions so fraught with weal or woe to their author. When such a hearing can be secured on the part of enlightened minds, I cannot say that I cherish much concern as to the issue." (Pp. 4–5.)

These last statements the author professedly makes in view of the fact, that, as regards the practical influence of his theory, it does not in the least tend to unsettle the faith or subvert the hopes of the Christian world, and hence need not create any special alarm on this head. He says very feelingly: "If I could deem myself to have come forth as an opponent to the great truth involved in the doctrine of the resurrection—if I had invaded in a ruthless way the faith of a future life, of immortality, of retribution—I might have stronger motives for seeking to soften the sentence which I could not hope to avoid. But it is not in this character that I claim to appear before the tribunal of the Christian public. There is nothing *destructive* in the bearings of the theory here presented. I have advanced nothing that is intrinsically calculated to weaken the force of the great moral sanctions of the Gospel. I leave the sublime announcements of the resurrection—the Judgment—Heaven—Hell—clothed with all their essential practical potency, as doctrines of revelation, though placed, as I trust, upon their true foundation, and elimnated from the mixtures of long adhering error. I may venture then to say, that whatever sentiments of repugnance the views here broached may encounter *in limine*, they will arise rather from the *hearsay results* which I have announced, than from a calm and candid scanning of the entire argument. The issue of this, I am confident, will be a far more elevated and satisfying view of man's ulterior destiny, than that which is afforded by the common construction of the subjects I have treated. The theory of the resurrection here announced, while it perfectly obviates the objections from reason, clothes the Scripture statements with a new interest, from the bare fact that they are seen to be capable of uttering their oracles in harmony with the dicta of science and philosophy." (Pp. 5–6.)

The author also very properly deprecates any harsh and hasty judgment, on the ground that his views, as any one may see, coincide to some extent with the views of Baron Swedenborg. He feels that such a discovery will most likely expose him to suspicion, and put him in an unfavorable light before the public. Hence, after claiming the indulgence of his readers for some probable " lapses of statement—some errors of reasoning—some faults of exposition" —he adds: " Especially would I express the hope that the avowed substantial identity of the theory with that of Swedenborg may not operate to the undue disparagement of the whole work. That I have been here and there indebted to Mr. Noble's able and interesting ' Appeal in Behalf of the Views of the Eternal World and State held by the New Jerusalem Church,' will be seen from the several quotations made from it; but I here repeat that my main results have been arrived at by a purely independent process. But the course of argument pursued by that writer I regard as sound and successful; and neither my convictions nor my habits allow me to consider the force of truth as neutralized by being found in connection with incidental errors. As to the claim of Swedenborg to have received his doctrine on this or other points by a supernatural illumination, I have nothing to say. The acquaintance I have been led to form with his character and writings, have inspired me, on the whole, with sentiments of respect for the man, while, at the same time, the very principle which he so strenuously inculcates, of admitting no evidence but that which satisfies the reason, prevents me from acceding to many of his leading views, particularly in the interpretation of Scripture." (P. 6.)

The author claims preference for his theory on the ground of certain practical advantages which it is supposed to possess over the common view. Whether or not this claim is sound and legitimate, we leave to the intelligent reader to judge. The passage referred to is as follows: "It can scarcely be necessary to remark, that the theory of the resurrection, disclosed in this volume, brings the present into entirely a new relation with the future life, and clothes the subject of human destiny with an interest to which no reflecting mind can be insensible. If well founded it strikes an effectual blow at all those crude anticipations which would throw forward the awards of eternity to an indefinitely future period, interposing an interval of such an extent as greatly to relax their force as moral sanctions, and plants us in the closest proximity to the spiritual world, with all its unutterable grandeur of interest and power of appeal. The ordinary gross conceptions of the local relations of heaven and hell to each other, and to the present sphere of our existence, are done away with; and we look to the precincts of our own bosoms for the constitutive elements of each." (P. 10.)

In order to obviate the charge of presumption in venturing to advocate views professedly in advance of those ordinarily held, the author lays down in his introduction the general principle that the knowledge of Revelation is progressive, and that, therefore, it is neither wrong nor indelicate to insist on claiming for the present age scriptural and theological views in advance of those of former ages. The universal admission of obscurities in the Holy Scriptures, is, in the view of the author, sufficient to warrant any claims of the kind that may be advanced, if done in the spirit of humility and moderation. Every other form of knowledge being progressive it is presumed that the knowledge of Divine revelation is also progressive. This general principle, it is thought, no one will deny. Indeed the greatest injury that can be inflicted on the Holy Scriptures and the supernatural revelation which they contain, is to deny, in this arbitrary way, their infinite fullness and consequent capacity of affording ever-increasing measures of spiritual knowledge to the sincere and humble student of Divine revelation. Not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, will the saints be employed in contemplating with ever-increasing delight and advantage the mystery of redeeming love; and, so far as we know, will never complete the search, nor fail to discover ever new and brighter displays of the divine goodness. If the study of the Scriptures be thus continuous, and the discovery of new and loftier views of divine truth in regard to the general contents of the Scriptures be possible, why not so also in regard to this particular subject—the resurrection of the dead? "That our collective humanity, like each individual that helps to compose it, passes through a childhood, a youth, and a meridian manhood, can scarcely be a question with any one who casts his eye at the page of history or the universal analogies of nature." On the ground of this general principle, then, the author claims the right of looking for higher and more advanced views of divine revelation relative to the particular point under consideration, as well as in regard to all other subjects of legitimate discussion. In this connection he quotes, with approbation, the saying of Lord Bacon: "Let no man, taking the credit of a sobriety and moderation ill-applied, think or maintain that men can search too far in the book of God's word; but rather let them excite themselves to the search, and boldly advance in the pursuit of an endless progress in it; only taking heed lest they apply their knowledge to arrogance and not to charity, to ostentation and not to use."

The main discussion is carried forward under two general heads; those, namely, of the "Rational Argument," and the "Scriptural Argument." In the prosecution of the Rational Argument, he treats successively of "Objections to the Common View," "Distinction of Personal and Bodily Identity," and of the "True Body of the Resurrection, as inferred by Reason."

The author having assumed that the principles of a sound philosophy and the general advancement in modern science aid us very materially in the solution of theological and Scriptural problems, deems it perfectly legitimate and safe to subject the doctrine of the resurrection to the test of enlightened reason. But both science and philosophy, he avers, interpose insuperable obstacles to the acceptance of the commonly received opinions on this subject. Foremost among these obstacles is the fact that our present bodies are constantly changing, so that they are never in exactly the same condition—never absolutely the same; so that the body which dies and is buried, is not the same as that in which the soul formerly lived and acted. This is an old objection to the resurrection of the body, and is based on the assumption that the very same body—as to its essential elements or material particles—that formed the habitat or vehicle of the soul here, died, and was buried, is to be raised up again hereafter, and reconstructed into the resurrection body. He quotes "Pearson on the Creed," to show that this is the prevailing view on the subject. This writer, as here quoted, speaks as follows: "That the same body, not any other, shall be raised to life, which died; that the same flesh which was separated from the soul at the day of death shall be united to the soul at the last day; that the same tabernacle which was dissolved shall be raised up again; that the same temple which was destroyed shall be rebuilt, is most apparent out of the same word, most evident upon the same grounds, upon which we believe there shall be any resurrection." Further on substantially the same language is used thus: "I am fully persuaded of this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that as it is appointed for all men once to die, so it is also determined that all men shall rise from death; that the souls separated from our bodies are in the hand of God and live; that the bodies, dissolved into dust or scattered into ashes, shall be recollected in themselves and re-united to their souls; that the same flesh which lived before shall be revived; that the same numerical bodies which did fall shall rise; that the resuscitation shall be universal, no man excepted, no flesh left in the grave; that all the just shall be raised to a resurrection of life, and all the unjust to a resurrection of damnation; that this shall be performed at the last day: and thus I believe 'THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.'" (Pp. 38–39.)

Since our bodies, according to the positive teachings of physiology, are constantly changing, and we thus come to have quite a number of different bodies during our lifetime, our author finds it difficult to determine which is really and most essentially our body—the body that should have the preference in the resurrection. "If the language above quoted be construed in the utmost strictness of its import, it forces upon us the conclusion that the identical body from which the soul took its departure at the moment of death, is the body the particles of which are to be re-collected and re-constructed at the era of the resurrection. But why shall the preference be given to these particular bodies, when, as is well known, they are often withered and wasted by consumption, swollen by dropsies, mangled by wounds, made hideous by deformities, curtailed of limbs, or become partially putrid by gangrenes? If the material particles of the body are to be re-assembled, why not rather suppose that it will be those which composed it in the period of its prime—in its utmost vigor and beauty?"

This difficulty, one would suppose, should not be deemed so very formidable, since the different bodies assumed to be possessed by us during the course of a long life, are after all substantially the same. The difficulty, if any, arises rather from the injudicious mode of stating the generally received opinions of the Church, than from the doctrine itself. It is perfectly clear that if we insist upon having the resurrection body to be constructed out of the very same elements, the identical particles, which entered into our body or bodies here, we become involved in endless absurdities. The doctrine of the resurrection, however, as generally held, does not require us to shoulder all these difficulties. It does not demand the re-collection of the very same particles that once composed our bodies, and their re-construction into the resurrection bodies; it insists only on the essential correspondence or substantial identity of the resurrection body with that which now forms the habitat of the soul. But our author finds still further difficulties in the extensive chemical changes which necessarily take place in the material of our bodies between death and the resurrection, and objects positively to any and every supposed resurrection of the material body on this same general ground. We give his own language, so as to be sure not to misrepresent him. "But, waiving all objection on this score—the score of incessant changes going on during life—the doctrine of the resurrection of the same body, in any sense whatever, encounters difficulties in our view absolutely insuperable, arising from the changes and new combinations which the particles of the dead body undergo in the interval between death and the resurrection. The putrescent relics of the goodly structure which once enshrined a human soul are dissolved into the dust of the earth. The dust springs up in the varied forms of vegetable life.

The beasts of the field crop the grasses and the herbs which derive their succulence from the constituent *material* of the bodies of buried men. Out of these eaters comes forth sweetness, and the flesh which was fed by the flesh of the fathers goes to the sustenance of the flesh of the sons. To whom shall these particles belong in the day of their final recall from these varied compositions?"

The same false and unwarranted assumption which gave rise to the former objection, we conceive, lies also at the bottom of the present difficulty; the assumption, namely, that the resurrection body is re-constructed out of the gross material—the substantial elements—of the mortal body that once enshrined the immortal spirit. This assumption is, in our view, wholly gratuitous, and does not fairly and fully represent the prevailing sentiment of the Christian world.

A difficulty apparently more serious and less liable to objection, is stated by our author, professedly based on the want of a proper and adequate relation subsisting between the dissolved earthly tenement and the future spiritual body to be re-constructed out of the elements which constitute our present earthly frame. At least the essential elements of the resurrection body, it is thought, should be at hand in the present organization, and afford some sort of prophetic intimations of what shall be the character of our future state. Analogies of this kind are found in every department of the external natural world below us, and would be thought most likely to be found in still greater abundance and perfection in the sphere of the human—the higher physical structure, related more immediately to the world of intelligence and will. The present order of the human world should be prophetic of the future, just as we actually find it to be the case in the world of nature generally. So thinks the author, and says: "We can easily conceive that a naturalist, who should never have seen or heard of a butterfly, might, upon investigating the inner structure of the caterpillar, and finding involved within it the rudiments of another organization, furnished with a curious apparatus adapted to some other sphere of existence—that he might form, at least, a very probable conjecture as to the mode of being upon which the developed insect would enter when disengaged from its present groveling tenement.

He would doubtless be at fault as to many of the details of the future economy of the insect, but he would still be able to give a very shrewd guess as to the sphere and the mode of existence into which it should emerge, and of the general laws by which it should be governed. In like manner, we see nothing irrational or improbable in the idea that a more intimate knowledge of the interior elements and functions of our physical and psychical constitution may finally enable us to educe the paramount laws of our future being, and bring us to a true 'Physical Theory of Another Life.'" From this work of Taylor, whose title is here given, the author cites a very beautiful passage, in confirmation of his views, which is as follows: "In every case, where a transition from one mode of life to another is to take place, the germs of the future being are wrapped in the organization of the present being; and, in every such instance, a well practised naturalist, in examining it (supposing it to have been hitherto unknown to him) during its initial stage, would, without hesitation, announce it to have in prospect another and higher mode of life; for he would discern within, or upon it, the symbols of its destined progression, and he would find in its habits certain instincts that have reference to a more perfect manner of existence. Now, is it so with man? We have already taken this for granted." So far Taylor. See the passage on page 140 of his work.

In regard to the closing remark and its application to the case in hand. our author differs in toto from Mr. Taylor. What one at least *seems* to affirm or take for granted, the other absolutely denies, and contends that the resurrection, in the common acception of the term, cannot turn back to any such prophetic pre-intimation of its future coming, and is utterly impossible except on the supposition of a stupendous miracle, in the sense of overriding and setting aside the ordinary laws of nature. Every other view, he contends, necessarily presupposes the existence of an intimate and *essential* relation between the present and the future body; but such a relation between the perishable elements of our earthly bodies and the living constituents of the future body, it is practically impossible to establish, or even to conceive. The existence of some mysterious vital germ, or *punctum saliens*, in the human body, which, it is supposed, will survive death and corruption, and form the basis of the resurrection body, as maintained by some, is declared to be absurd—the relic of a by-gone age. But, even if the supposition were true, and the natural development of such a physico-spiritual body were conceivable, it would be entirely useless, in the view of Dr. Bush, since, according to his supposition, as we shall soon see, we already have a spiritual body for the soul fully formed, and ready to be eliminated from the present physical structure at the instant of death. Besides, even if a body were then to be formed, there is no reason why it should be constructed out of its own pre-existing materials. "If a man retained precisely the same body unchanged from his natal to his dying day, the difficulty would not be so glaringly insurmountable; but, even in that case, as the resurrection body is to be a spiritual body, it confounds our faculties to attempt to imagine of what use the former material and fleshly particles are to be in the formation of a purely spiritual body. Is it not as easy for Omnipotence to form a spiritual body entirely new, without reference to any pre-existing materials, as to elaborate one out of the gross component parts of a previous body? And is not Mr. Locke's remark, in his letter to Stillingfleet, perfectly well founded, that 'it would be hard to determine, if that were demanded, what greater congruity the soul hath with any particles of matter which were once united to it, but are now so no longer, than it hath with particles of matter that were never united to it?'" (P. 43.)

The answer that is usually returned to the inquiry, as to what body is to be raised up in the last day, naturally gives rise to the formidable objections, which, in the view of the author, have not only been legitimately urged, but also clearly established in opposition to the common view. This, of course, assumes the resurrection of the very same body that once lived and died, in all its essential *material* elements, if we are to abide by the literal sense of the citations from "Pearson on the Creed." This assumed resurrection of the same body the author denies, and asserts it to be wholly at variance with the dictates of reason and the known facts in the case—the circumstance, namely, that the human body is never absolutely the same, even for a single day, and that the essential elements of which it is composed enter successively into quite a number of other and greatly diversified bodies; hence the difficulty of reconstructing from these widely disseminated and variously organized elements the future resurrection bodies of the saints. Adding to this prime difficulty the fact that there is no perceptible connection or organic relation between the two classes of bodies, the case becomes desperate. So, at least, we are told. "Now this, we contend, is precisely the difficulty that weighs upon the common theory of the resurrection of the body. According to this theory there is just that break—that huge interruption—in the continuous agency of the vital principle, which makes it so impossible to discover or define the *relation* between the buried and the beatified body. The latent link which connects the two entirely escapes detection, and yet it is upon the presence of this link alone that we can predicate identity of the two structures."

From the consideration of these difficulties which are supposed to encumber the common view of the resurrection, the author proceeds to discuss the second general topic—that of Personal and Bodily Identity, and the necessary distinction between them. He lays much stress on this distinction, and imagines that a proper understanding of this one point would do very much towards dissipating the mists of error which linger around and obscure the subject in its ordinary apprehension. "Without a clear perception of this distinction the true doctrine of the resurrection will fail to be grasped. When once apprehended, we are immediately freed from all embarrassment on the score of unceasing succession in particles. Affixing the seat of identity to the seat of personality, we can see the body wasting by exhalations and repairing itself by new accretions, and still perceive the central substratum of our being remaining unmoved, indestructible, and eternal, in the midst of all cycles of change. Something assuredly there is, which lives abiding and untouched in the midst and in spite of the incessant flux of our corporeal existence. In that something our personality inheres, and to it our true identity cleaves."

Whether this matter of the proposed distinction between personal and bodily identity is so vital to the question in hand may be reasonably doubted. For personality, as something purely abstract—separate and distinct from a living, thinking, and acting subject—is, we apprehend, of little account. Only when viewed in connection with a living agent does personality become a matter of importance in a discussion of this kind; and then the same difficulties substantially, which meet us in regard to bodily identity, meet us also here. For, assuredly, no living subject can be conceived of as remaining always exactly the same. The soul, the seat of intelligence, in which personality inheres, just as really and as truly as the body, is incessantly changing, and is never for a single moment *absolutely* the same either. The saints, as to their interior life, are undergoing continual changes, and it is difficult to say whether, amidst the incessant bodily changes, there is not after all just as much of a continuity of the substantial physical being or higher bodily nature, as there is a continuity of the inner spiritual being or concrete personal life of men. For all we know there may be just as real and substantial a bond of a refined physical character invisibly subsisting between the present and the future—the spiritual resurrection body. Nor is it at all clear that so much stress should be laid on the presence in our physical system of a distinct prophetic symbol or pre-intimation of the coming future body—cognizable in our present imperfect state. Such a pre-intimation or prophecy of what is coming in the way of transmutations, and of the nature of these metamorphoses, in the world around us, is not always, nor indeed generally found to be cognizable to the senses; and yet there we see such physical changes and transmutations taking place continually in one way or the other. Admitting this fact, how can we consistently expect and so strenuously insist upon finding such pre-intimations in the case of our own present physical organization, in its relation to the spiritual and eternal world!

We pass on to notice the author's third or last topic under this general head, namely, "The true Body of the Resurrection, as inferred by Reason." His views in regard to the nature of the future spiritual or resurrection body have been already in part anticipated; but we wish to present the reader with the author's own definitions, and the reasonings by means of which he seeks to establish his sentiments. "The resurrection body is that part of our present being to which the *essential life* of the man pertains. We may not be able to see it, to handle it, to analyze it, or to describe it. But we know that it exists, because we know that we ourselves exist. It constitutes the inner essential vitality of our present bodies, and it lives again in another state *because it never dies.* It is immortal in its own nature, and is called a *body*—a spiritual body—because the poverty of human language, or perhaps the weakness of the human mind, forbids the adoption of any more fitting term by which to express it. It is, however, a body which has nothing to do with the gross material particles which enter into the composition of our present earthly tenements." (P. 70.) We deem it unnecessary to say that this view, if strictly followed out to its ultimate consequences, strikes a death-blow at the doctrine of the resurrection as usually apprehended and taught. Indeed, the author feels this himself, and shrinks not from shouldering the dread responsibility of the announcement. After trying to explain his statements and to justify his course, he says: "We cannot be unconscious, however, that we must here be prepared to encounter the query, whether, upon the view now presented, the doctrine of the resurrection does not in fact resolve itself simply into the doctrine of immortality—whether it does not in reality exclude the present corporeal fabric from any participation in the resurrection, and virtually abolish the distinction, *as usually conceived,* between soul and body in the future life? A fair question, doubtless, in reply to which our first remark is, that if our previous train of reasoning be sound and unimpeachable, and if this be the natural, obvious, and inevitable sequence which is forced upon us, we see not why we should shrink from it. But, secondly, we observe that on no subject in the whole circle of human knowledge are we more in the dark than in regard to what is usually termed the *soul.* It is common to speak on this subject as if the soul were mere abstract thought—pure intellection—capable of subsisting in another world in the most absolute and isolated state, without any kind of connection with any sort of body. But is thought substance? In order to thought must there not be something which thinks?—something of which thought is the attribute, and not the essence? While our reason assures us that the power of thought does not pertain to the gross physical fabric which remains when the inhabiting spirit has taken its flight, we are still unable to resist the impression that it does inhere in *something* which goes forth at the same time with the vital principle, and that *something* we believe cannot be disconnected from the ψυχή—*psyche.*" Acknowledging our general ignorance of the mysteries of nature—the potent agencies which are everywhere at work—the author says: "But science has reached results which certainly warrant the conclusion that all nature is pervaded by these active energies, and that we are living and moving in the midst of elements which directly take hold of the inner vitalities of our being, and from the action of which a spiritual body may be developed by established laws, as soon as the present tenement is forsaken by its informing principle. To the question whether such a body shall be material or immaterial, we may pledge ourselves to return an answer, when the naturalist shall inform us whether light is material or immaterial; whether electricity, electro-magnetism, caloric, and the principle of gravitation, are material or immaterial; in regard to which no one is at present prepared to affirm either the one or the other. (Pp. 70–74.)

We have already given sufficient extracts to show the general drift of the author's views; but, in order to do him full justice, we yet transcribe the following passages in which he more accurately defines his idea of the spiritual body, and points out the relation of the present—rational—to the scriptural argument, on which he is about to enter. "It would seem, then, upon the whole, from a collation of all the grounds on which an opinion is to be formed, that the judgment of reason would be, *that a spiritual body is developed* at death. By *spiritual*, in this connection, we mean refined, subtle, etherial, sublimated. By the development of a spiritual body, we mean the disengagement—the extrication—of that psychical part of our nature, with which vital and animal functions are, in the present life, intimately connected, and which differs from the pure spirit, the intellectual principle, as the Greek ψυχή, or *sensitive principle*, differs from νους, the *self-conscious intelligence*. It is a *tertium quid*—an intermediate something between the cogitative faculty and the gross body. It is indeed invisible; but so are many of the mightiest agencies in nature, and so are many of the noblest entities in the ranks of created beings." (P. 78.)

And so further on, summing up this part of his subject, he says: "It will have been seen, from the tenor of the preceding pages, that the argument from reason leads by fair and unforced inference to the conclusion, that the true doctrine of the resurrection is that of the development of a spiritual body at death from the bodies which we now inhabit. It now remains to inquire what countenance this view of the subject receives from an equally fair and blameless interpretation of the canon of Scripture. If the teachings of the divine volume array themselves so unequivocally and inexorably against the conclusions to which we are brought by the argument from reason, that we can by no process of conciliation harmonize the two, undoubtedly we are required to abide by the Scriptural decision, whatever violence it may seem to do to our rational deductions." (Pp. 84–85.)

In conducting the Scriptural argument, our author carefully and critically examines all the passages, both in the Old and the New Testament, which are usually adduced as bearing on the subject. In trying to break the force of an argument, or to bring a particular passage to favor his own view, he frequently re-translates, and gives what he terms a more correct version of the original. His expositions are sometimes plausible and convincing—at other times horribly distorted, far-fetched, and unnatural. Before proceeding to the examination of particular passages, he furnishes a short chapter on what he styles ONOMATOLOGY; OR, DEFINITION OF TERMS. In order to prepare his readers for the coming exposition, he says at the very opening of this chapter, that since "the intimations in the Old Testament of the doctrine of the *resurrection of the body* are at best extremely dubious, so the occurrence of corresponding terms by which to express it is in proportion but little to be looked for. As the idea, however, of such a resurrection is not unknown to the Jewish writers, there are one or two phrases which are by them somewhat familiarly and technically applied to it. The principal of these are *tekoomah* and *teheyah*, the former derived from *koom, to stand up*, and the latter from *hayah, to live*. To the former the Greek word στάσις or ἀνάστασις *standing* or *standing again*, corresponds; to the latter, ἀναβίωσις or ζωοποίησις, *revivification* or *reviviscence*. The use of *tekoomah* in this sense is probably to be traced in the main to Ps. i: 5, where it is said, 'the ungodly shall not stand—*yakumoo*—in judgment,' which many of the Rabbins understand as equivalent to a denial that the wicked shall rise at the last day. The current Hebrew term for *resuscitate* or *vivify* is *hayah*, in the Piel or causative form, a pertinent instance of which occurs in Hos. vi: 2, where, in fact, both terms are met with 'After two days will he *revive us—yechyyenu*; in the third day *he will raise us up—yekimenu*, and *we shall live—nichyeh*—in his sight.' Hence the phrase *techayyath hammethim—quickening of the dead*, is of familiar use in the Rabbinical writings, and traceable to a variety of passages, which, though conveying the sense of a spiritual or allegorical revival only, they have generally interpreted according to the strictness of the letter, and built upon them the tenet of a corporeal resurrection." (Pp. 94–95.)

From the tenor of these philological or critical remarks, we may easily conjecture the special use to be made of the words which have been here introduced and defined by the respected author. These terms he almost uniformly employs in a symbolical or figurative sense, as denoting the civil and political elevation of the Jewish people, and especially also their spiritual resuscitation in the days of the Messiah.

After this brief philological excursus, the author proceeds to the examination of particular passages. It is not necessary that we should notice *all* the passages adduced and explained. The principal ones from the Old Testament are those found in Job xix: 25–27; Ps. xvi: 9–10; Isa. xxvi: 19; Hos. vi: 2, xiii: 14; and Dan. xii: 2. The memorable declaration of Job is unhesitatingly put aside as having no reference directly to the resurrection of the dead. This view of the case is supported by a reference to the exposition of Mr. Barnes, who says: "So far as I can see, all that is fairly implied in the passage, when properly interpreted, is fully met by the events recorded in the close of the book. Such an interpretation meets the exigency of the case, accords with the strain of the argument and with the result, and is the most simple and natural that has been proposed." In regard to the passage from the sixteenth Psalm, he says: "The fact of a resurrection is undoubtedly taught in these words, and yet from the inspired comment of Peter, Acts ii: 29–31, it is clear that it is a resurrection predicted of the body of Christ, and not of the bodies of men in general." The prophecy in Isaiah is referred, on the authority of Mr. Barnes, to the restoration of Israel to their covenant privileges. It is but just, however, to say that "Mr. Barnes, in agreement with Lowth, adds in this connection, 'Though this does not refer primarily to the resurrection of the dead, yet the illustration is drawn from that doctrine, and implies that the doctrine was one with which they were familiar. An image which is employed for the sake of illustration must be one that is familiar to the mind, and the reference here to this doctrine, as an *illustration*, is a demonstration that the doctrine of the resurrection was well known! The same position was assumed in the early days of the Christian fathers.' " Hosea's beautiful prediction, which reads: "After two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight"—is referred, like that of the Psalmist, to the times of the Messiah. "That an event denominated *a resurrection* was connected, in the minds of the ancient Jews, with this day or period of the Messiah, and that this expectation is sustained by the general tenor of their Scriptures, we think beyond doubt. But this still leaves the question open as to the *true nature of the resurrection*—a question upon which we shall hope to throw light as we proceed." The other passage from the same prophet, quoted by St. Paul in his memorable discussion of the resurrection, the author proposes to explain in connection with that place. (Pp. 99–130.)

The last of the Old Testament passages to which we desire to call attention is found in Dan. xii: 2, reading as follows: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." On this language the author makes the following remarks: "This brief passage contains, more emphatically perhaps than any other in the Old Testament, the germ of the resurrection doctrine. It is incessantly referred to by the Rabbinical writers who have treated of the subject, and has exercised a controlling influence on the literal statements of Christ and the Apostles. It becomes, therefore, a matter of the utmost moment to determine, if possible, its true sense. The question, how far it implies the idea of a corporeal resurrection, will naturally be resolved by the results of such an inquiry. The difficulties are confessedly great which attend a proper solution, and the issue may still leave some points more or less doubtful." He renders the passage thus: "And many of the sleepers of the dust of the ground shall awake—these (the awakened) to everlasting life, and those (the unawakened) to shame and everlasting contempt." The following citations will give the reader an idea of the solution proposed. "(1) The 'awaking' is evidently predicated of the 'many,' and not of the whole. It will be observed that the phrase is not 'many,' in the absolute sense, which might perhaps be understood of all, but 'many of,' which plainly conveys the idea of restriction, distinguishing a part from the whole. (2) The true sense of the original *elleh—ve-elleh,* is not *some—and some,* but *these—and those,* referring respectively to subjects previously indicated. By the former erroneous rendering a distinction is constituted between two classes of those *who are awakened;* by the latter between those who *are* and those who *are not* awakened. (3) The usage which obtains in regard to the Hebrew term *kuts*=*yakatz* awake, confirms this view. This term, in such a connection, does not well admit of being taken in any but a good sense. The Psalmist says of himself, Ps. xvii: 15, 'As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied *when I awake* (*behaketz*), with thy likeness.' As the result of the whole, then we give the following as the correct explication of the passage, which will at once afford an answer to the objection, that the same thing—viz: awaking—is predicated of both classes: 'And many of the sleepers of the dust shall awake: these (the awakened)—shall be—to everlasting life; and those (the unawakened)—shall be—to shame and everlasting contempt.' This we have learned, since first adopting this view, is the interpretation suggested by some of the Jewish school, and is undoubtedly very ancient." This passage, also, with the events which it predicts, is referred to the days of the Messiah, and is supposed to describe what actually occurred during the personal ministry of Christ, in part, and subsequently in the course of the Church's history as carried forward from age to age by his chosen instruments. "While, then, we cannot question that the words before us refer to the cases of bodily resurrection recorded by the Evangelists, we are at the same time strong in the persuasion that they possess a vastly grander scope, and find their fulfillment in that sublime career of *moral regeneration* which forms so much of the history of Christianity from age to age. And it is doubtless to this text that we are to trace the origin of the phraseology so common in the New Testament, by which the resurrection is represented as a *resurrection from among or out of the dead*—ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν. This usage is very remarkable, and must be founded upon some sufficient reason." (Pp. 131–140.)

We shall now proceed to give the author's views on some of the most remarkable passages in the New Testament, which are usually cited in connection with the doctrine of a future resurrection of the body. Our main object has been all along to furnish an honest and connected statement of what the "Anastasis" teaches, and in order to do this fairly and effectually, we have preferred in most cases to let the author himself speak and define his position. We shall pursue the same course in reference to what he has to say on the teachings of the New Testament—appending, as occasion may be given, our own remarks in the way of explanation or criticism.

Dr. Bush, assuming "that the doctrine declared by Christ on this subject would be in the main a fuller and clearer enunciation of the very doctrine so darkly intimated in the Jewish Scriptures"—that is, the doctrine of immortality simply, or the continuance of our being in the world to come—finds it necessary to define and fix the meaning and force of the word ἀνάστασις, which, he observes, is most commonly employed in the New Testament to designate the future state, and is usually rendered "resurrection"—*resurgence* or re-rising. He admits that this word or phrase is "drawn from *corporeal* objects, and suggests, at first blush, what we may term a corporeal idea." He, however, goes on to say, that "it does not appear that any more is necessarily included in the term, in this connection, than the simple sense of *reviviscence*, without any reference to the rising again of the defunct body." Starting out with this sweeping assumption, he finds it easy to show, that, according to his method of interpretation, "the prevailing sense of *resurrection* in the New Testament is simply that of future existence—*the future state or immortality.*" There is, however, one other term which he sees proper to define, viz., ἐγείρω—to *raise*—with its derivation ἔγερσις—*raising.* He admits, indeed, that "the leading idea conveyed by this word is undoubtedly that of raising in a *physical sense,*" but thinks that its true import, in specific cases, must be determined by the truth of the doctrine, where this can be ascertained on other and satisfactory grounds.

With these preliminary statements and explanations, he proceeds to an examination of the resurrection, which, in the sense in which it is usually held, he flatly denies, on the ground, mainly, "that it is nowhere explicitly affirmed in the narrative of the evangelists, or any other part of the Scriptures, that the identical natural body of Christ arose," contending that "the ressurrection-state of Jesus was unquestionably the same with that of his glorious—pre-incarnate—or Shekinah state." We cannot stop here to state the different reasons which he furnishes in support of this singularly unfortunate and anti-Scriptural view. It is easy to see, however, that, occupying such a position, we virtually repudiate the incarnation, reduce this greatest of mysteries to the character of a mere phantom, and practically ignore the coming of God's Son in the flesh. He does not, we presume, mean all this. His greatest difficulty seems to arise from the strangely confused and inadequate ideas which he entertains relative to the words "spiritual" and "material," as applied to the body of our Saviour and to those of His saints. In speaking of the nature of the future or resurrection body elsewhere, he freely admits that we cannot positively and with any assurance assert that the refined, subtle, ethereal, or glorified body, as he chooses to call it, may not after all be *material,* just as we are wholly unprepared to define and fix the true character of electricity, electro-magnetism, caloric, and other substances of a like nature. He sees this difficulty, and is free to confess it; but practically ignores it. He finds it utterly impossible, it would seem, to distinguish between a grossly sensuous and a refined material, or physico-spiritual and glorified body. Matter with him is always identical with what is crude, earthly, perishable—essentially corrupt, and incapable of being elevated, sanctified, and fitted for the heavenly state. Hence he always speaks of the resurrection, except in his own sense, as involving gross, earthly, sensuous ideas—a view against which the whole Christian world, fully as much so as Dr. Bush, warmly and earnestly protests. That the Saviour arose from the grave and ascended to heaven in a spiritual body all Christian people everywhere believe and hold, unless, indeed, we make "spiritual" to mean something unreal, mythical, fantastic, and visionary. We cannot help feeling that with all his efforts to claim for the soul something more than belongs to abstract thought, and to clothe it with some real, substantial, and abiding vestment, as it leaves the earthly tenement, Dr. Bush is after all a pure Spiritualist—unable, from his peculiar stand-point, to grasp and appreciate the Scriptural idea of a future glorification of the body. Hence he signally fails, in our estimation, to grasp the mystery of Christ's resurrection and its relation to the future glorification of the saints—our Lord being not only "the first-begotten from the dead," but also the glorious pledge and pattern of our own blessed resurrection.

From this general survey of the resurrection of Christ, our author proceeds to an examination of St. Paul's great argument for the resurrection of the saints, as this is made to rest ultimately upon that of our Lord. The fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians has always been regarded as furnishing the fullest statement and most triumphant vindication of the future resurrection of the body—the final glorification of the saints. Our author disposes of this elaborate discussion of the inspired Apostle, and of his beautiful and highly appropriate illustrations of the doctrine on hand, in the same easy way in which he disposed of other portions of the Scriptures, by an application of the same spiritualistic principles of interpretation which he found to be so convenient and effective on previous occasions. He can see nothing whatever in the representations and reasonings of the Apostle to favor the idea of a future resurrection of the body. In his view, both the Apostle's argument and illustrations are far more favorable to a purely spiritual resurrection than to that of the body. Referring to St. Paul's illustration of the springing grain, and the argument for the future resurrection of the body founded upon the implied analogy, he says: "We cannot understand the Apostle's reasoning, unless he means to affirm that there is something of the nature of a germ which emanates from the defunct body, and forms either the substance or the nucleus of the future resurrection body. But this principle we contend to be what the Apostle calls *spiritual;* that is, invisible, impalpable, refined, ethereal—something that is essentially connected with vital operations, something that is exhaled with the dying breath, or, in other words, that goes forth from the body *before it is consigned to the dust*—for, after the body has mouldered away in the grave, we perceive not how any germ or embryo is ever to emanate from it. With our present light we must believe that the only germ in the human body answering to the germ in the plant, and upon which the Apostle's comparison is built, is *the spiritual body itself.*" (Pp. 178–179.)

There are two or three incidental passages in the writings of St.

Paul, which, from their peculiar structure, puzzled Dr. Bush not a little, and required strong efforts on his part to give them such a turn as naturally to chime in with his spiritualistic views. Two of these passages are found in the Epistle to the Romans. One reads thus: "But if the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii. 11. The mention of "mortal bodies," as subjects of the quickening influences of the Holy Ghost, naturally invests them with an extraordinary degree of importance. The author feels the force of the word "mortal," as connected with "bodies," and seeks to get over the difficulty by attaching to the word "body" or "bodies," as here used, a "somewhat figurative" sense, denoting, "not so much the physical organization in distinction from the soul as the body considered as the seat and subject of moral corruption, and thus set in opposition to the spiritual or renewed part of our nature." This may all be very true; but if the Holy Ghost—the Lord of life—thus dwells in our "mortal bodies," and quickens them, why should they not, after such an act of grace, be also deemed worthy of a still further sanctification and a consummated final glorification? Indeed, the author in his exposition of this very passage, partially admits such a glorifying process through the effectual indwelling of Christ in us by the Holy Ghost. He says: "This principle of divine life, thus infused into the soul which inhabits a body morally dead, will gradually work outward from its centre, and quicken that body also with a divine vitality. For, as this principle of life flows from Him, 'who hath life in Himself,' and who gave such a demonstration of its efficacy in raising up Christ from the dead, the supposition is perfectly easy, that the same power is competent to a complete spiritual quickening of the whole man in his saints, so that they shall stand before him as in the highest sense *alive*, soul, spirit, and body." We ask, then, if there be such a divine quickening of the whole man, why should not the whole man also participate in the glorious resurrection and the blessed life to come?

In the other passage, found in this epistle (Rom. viii. 23), occurs the phrase: "Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." To get rid of the force of this passage and the countenance it lends to the doctrine of a future resurrection of the body, it is proposed to apply the term " body" to the entire Church—the collective body of believers. Whether this application of the term "body" will help the matter any, in the way of neutralizing or preventing its application to individual believers and their hope for the ultimate redemption of their bodies, we leave to the intelligent reader to decide. To our own mind the redemption of the whole body of the saints secures, also, the redemption of all its component parts —the sanctified members of that mystical body of which Christ is the ever-living and glorious Head. The other passage referred to (Phil. iii. 21) is very similar to the one just noticed, and is disposed of very much in the same way. It reads thus: " Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." Dr. Bush says: " We have here another instance of that remarkable usage upon which we have before commented, in which 'body' is used in the singular, whereas, on the common apprehension, we can see no reason why the plural —'bodies'—should not have been employed. From repeated intimations we are assured that our resurrection-bodies are to be of the same nature with that of Christ. Of such bodies is the whole redeemed and glorified Church to be possessed." The author, however, doubts the reference of this passage to the last times, and suggests that "even if the words be taken as they usually are, as having reference to the change that shall pass upon the bodies of individual believers at the last day," the Apostle may have in view rather "the translation of the living than the resurrection of the dead saints." But how this suggestion is to alter the case we cannot imagine. Surely the spiritualizing and glorifying of the body is just as easy and just as probable in the resurrection act of the sleeping saints, when the Lord shall come, as in the translation of the living. We care nothing about the mode or form of the process, only so that our "vile body" is changed by the power of Christ, and " fashioned like unto His glorious body."

Omitting several other instances, we pass on to notice the remarkable passage found in 2 Cor. v. 1–4. This place deserves special notice, both from a consideration of its intrinsic beauty and importance, as well as from the peculiarity of the Apostle's representation. Dr. Bush says: " Several points, having an important bearing on our theme, disclose themselves in this passage. In the first place, it cannot be doubted that the 'house from heaven,' for which the Apostle longs, is the same with the 'spiritual body' of which he speaks (1 Cor. xv. 44). Secondly, it is clear, we think, that Paul expected to be clothed upon with this heavenly house *as soon as he left the material body.* This is evident from the whole strain of his discourse, but especially from verses 6–8; 'knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord.'" How the "several points" adduced can have an "important bearing" on the author's spiritualistic position, we are unable to perceive. We may freely admit all that he says about the "house from heaven," and St. Paul's earnest expectation of being "clothed upon" with this house, as soon as he left this material body, without in the least compromising our view of the resurrection; for it is altogether likely that the Apostle, with many others, just at this time fully expected and anxiously looked for a speedy coming of the Lord, when, as a matter of course, the instantaneous change from death to life, from corruption to incorruption, and from the earthly to the heavenly state, should take place. But are we absolutely certain that no "clothing" or "clothing upon" of the soul can take place, in any sense, except by the putting on of the resurrection body? May not the regenerate soul, in the ordinary process of its sanctification, become so essentially invested with the garment of salvation, that, in the event of death, and its final separation from the body, it may not be left "naked" or "unclothed?" Or, rather, may not the rudiments and initial or elementary framework of the "house from heaven" be gradually and silently forming around the struggling spirit—thus laying the foundation here already for the future resurrection-body? In our view of the subject such a thing is not at all impossible, nor even improbable. And should we refer this passage to the instant of death, may not both the "clothing," and "clothing upon," mentioned in this connection, be but the preliminary investiture of the departing spirit—the garment of life and light—the spiritual habitat of the disembodied soul, fitting it for its blissful abode in the spirit world—the *status intermedius*—until it shall attain to its consummated "adoption," the full redemption of the body? Such a supposition is not at all beyond the range of probability, nor is it unworthy of the blessed Gospel of the grace of God.

We wish to notice only one other specimen of this spiritualistic method of interpretation, in order to get rid of an unpleasant difficulty. It is found in connection with 1 Thess. iv. 13–17. This passage is extremely strong and explicit in reference to the future resurrection of the saints, and the stirring events which are to accompany that sublime scene. To render it subservient to his own theory and make it bear testimony in favor of a spiritualistic resurrection coincident with death, the author finds it necessary to give a peculiar turn to several terms or expressions employed by the Apostle. He says: "In the general interpretation of the passage a serious embarrassment arises from the difficulty of determining the precise import of ἂξει—"will bring." To what does this refer? Does it imply that when our Lord descends from heaven, with this predicted pomp and glory, He will be attended by an accompaniment of saints who have formerly slept in Him? If so, the following is perhaps the view which is to be deduced from the Apostle's language: "When the Lord comes, at this crisis, he shall *bring with him* his saints who have slept in him"—these saints being regarded as having "previously risen," by making πρῶτον=προτερον, and translating the future ἀναστήσονται, "shall arise," as if it were a future perfect, to be translated "shall have arisen," so as to make them to be with the Lord in their spiritual bodies, and thus in a condition to accompany Him in His descent. Assuming the substantial correctness of this rendering, the author says: "What inference, then, more fair, than that these words, instead of teaching the resurrection of the body at the coming of Christ, teach directly the reverse? The entire stress of the argument rests upon this very assumption, that the saints who had slept in Jesus were with Him in heaven, as, otherwise, how could they come with Him when He descends from heaven? But if they were with Him in heaven, must they not previously have arisen, in order that they might be with Him, and come with Him? And if they come with Him, must it not be in resurrection-bodies? Is it for a moment conceivable that this locomotion would be predicated of men's intellectual spirits, separate from all kind of corporeity? How can such spirits be said to *come*? Surely if the sleepers in Jesus have previously *risen*, they must exist in resurrection-bodies, and therefore must *come* in resurrection-bodies, as the Lord Himself comes."

This, it must be confessed, is a very bold and unnatural assumption, based upon a violent and far-fetched interpretation of terms, especially of the phrase οὕτω καὶ ὁ Θεὸς. . . . ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ—"even so them also which sleep in Jesus *will God bring with Him.*" Even allowing the validity of his criticism on πρῶτον, as if it were of like import, in the particular instances cited, with πρότερον, we must still regard his exposition of the passage in hand as extremely doubtful and unlikely. The whole tenor of the Apostle's reasoning, according to our apprehension, is against the proposed rendering. The author himself seems to have felt this; and hence he supplements the statement of his own views as follows: "There is perhaps, a more unforced air of probability in the construction which makes the writer to say that, as God intends to have his people ultimately with Him, as well as Christ their head, so one great object of His second coming might well be represented to be to *gather home* his sleeping and living saints in one united company, the first class to be reclaimed from the power of the grave, in which they had been resting, and the other to be translated, which would of course bring them into the same condition with that of the risen dead. Accordingly, in pursuing the thread of the announcement, He may be considered as saying, that the first step will be to raise the sleepers in the dust, and invest them with their resurrection bodies. When this is accomplished he will immediately proceed, ἔπειτε, then—to work that stupendous miracle upon the living saints, which shall fit them for entering into a spiritual kingdom; and, this effected, both classes shall be caught together—ἅμα—in clouds, or vast numbers, to meet the Lord in the air."

This statement we conceive to be just, and to constitute a far more correct and natural rendering of the Apostle's meaning than that adopted by the sainted author. St. Paul's language does not, in any way, countenance the idea that the departed saints have already arisen, or rather that they had received their resurrection bodies at the time of leaving this world, so that the day of their death was also literally the day of their resurrection. Far more natural is it to understand the Apostle as connecting the raising up of the dead, and the translation of the living saints, so as to have all of them together to meet the Lord in the air, and thus be "ever with the Lord."

We have now finished our task. We have had under review all the leading passages of Scripture cited by the author, and so explained as, if possible, to prove his theory of an exclusively spiritual resurrection, and that in immediate connection with death. We have endeavored to give condensed but faithful statements of his views on the subject of the resurrection itself, as well as of his explanations of the several Scripture passages adduced in proof of his peculiar views. We have appended to these statements such remarks and criticisms of our own as the case seemed to require. We repeat, then, that our task is performed, and our part of the work accomplished. We leave it to the candid readers of the Review to decide as to the character of the book which we have tried to bring in review before them. We wish only yet to say that we consider the book a very able and interesting production, eminently worthy of a careful perusal, and well calculated to throw light on a subject confessedly dark and mysterious.

In conclusion, it may not be improper to observe that the latter portion of the work which we have reviewed, is devoted to the subject of the general judgment. But, inasmuch as this subject does not legitimately fall within the province of our present discussion, we shall not take any further notice of it than simply to remark that the author's sentiments on this subject are in full accord with his spiritualistic views on the subject of the resurrection. Both the one and the other are made to run fully parallel with the current history of Christianity itself. As he knows of no future resurrection, in the proper sense of that term, so he knows of no future or general judgment. To substantiate this assertion, and give the reader some idea of the author's sentiments, we beg leave to introduce the following brief citations: "If the anticipated judgment really coincides, according to the true tenor of revelation, in point of time with the resurrection, and the real resurrection ensues immediately at death, then all argument is useless either in support or denial of the fact, that each individual soul must be, in effect, judged as soon as the spirit leaves the body. Our sentence, in truth, is passed before our grave is dug.—If adequate evidence has been adduced that the resurrection, upon accurate inquest, actually expands itself into an unfolding process, covering the lapse of successive generations, it is far from inconceivable that the judgment, when submitted to the same rigid test, may present itself under the same aspect; and that, too, without losing any portion of its power as a great moral sanction under the divine administration.—No article of any creed in Christendom is more universally and unhesitatingly held than that each individual enters at death upon an eternal state of retribution. Consequently, no subsequent judicial sentence can be conceived as reversing that which is in effect passed at the instant the soul leaves the body; nor can the object of such a general assize as is usually understood to be announced under the title of the 'general judgment,' be to enact *de novo* a process which has really been accomplished upon each individual of the race as he entered, in his turn, the world of retribution."

ART. II.—RELATION OF SCIENCE AND FAITH.

ADDRESS.*

GENTLEMEN OF THE ALUMNI, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—It is said that in the beautiful city of Venice, when the clock strikes twelve, the pigeons in large numbers come flocking in from all parts of the city to the public square, in order to be fed. Here citizens and strangers vie with each other in their kindly office, and the whole scene is one of intense animation and pride.

Not unlike this is this annual gathering of the sons of "Our Alma Mater," in order that they may share in the social and intellectual feast its munificent hand is wont to spread before us. From city and town, from hill-side and vale, and from all the various callings and occupations of life, are the sons our of "Alma Mater" here.

And whilst they drink from the crystal streams which flow from its classic halls, they linger also beneath its refreshing shade, and seek to live over again, if only for the short space of an hour, the sweet memories of the past. *Live over again?* Nay, gentlemen; for when, on the silvery wing of time, our opportunities, our pleasures and responsibilities, have once been borne into the past, they are irretrievably gone. By no effort of the imagination, no impulse of the heart, no feat of the will, can we call before us and again enjoy our privileges past. Still, memory, like a guardian angel, always present, may, by a power akin to that of the Divine hand, call to resurrection the *issues* of by-gone days, and minister in kindly office until a thousand or more associations here come crowding in upon the heart; and the sterner, deadlier conflicts of the present are forgotten amid the recollections of the past.

And now, standing as we do along the pathway of life, and stretching almost from its remotest milestones back to the very threshold of our "Alma Mater," it seems right that on an occasion like this we should select for our consideration a subject which, to some extent at least, has for us a common interest. And, amid the conflict of mind and thought at present agitating the world, we have selected as *such a subject*, "The Relation of Science and Faith."

---

*Delivered before the Alumni Association of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster Pa., on the evening of June 29th (Commencement Week A. D., 1875), by Dr. S. B. Kieffer, A. M., of Carlisle Pa., and published here by order of said Association.

Human life is confronted on every hand, not only with a subjective consciousness, but an objective reality. This objective reality finds expression on the one hand in the order of nature, and reaches our consciousness, by its laws and forces, through our physical senses. It reaches us, however, also as from *above* and *beyond* nature, as has been attested by the universal consciousness of the race, and, as the supernatural confronts us, through our moral and our spiritual apprehensions.

In the order of nature, there is an adaptation and design for our subjective life and health. In the order of the supernatural, there is a power and influence which inspire the human heart with noble impulses, lofty aspirations, and a sincere longing and desire after something beyond itself.

For the *solution* of nature's problem, in its relations to man's highest physical destiny, we have especially the physical sciences.

And for the solution of the problem of man's relations to the supernatural, we have, reaching out from his deepest consciousness, the highest manifestations of *will*, in the form of intellectual Science; but more especially that supernatural power and grace, which is called Faith.

Now science and faith stand in important relations to each other; but are, *primarily, antagonistic.* The one involves the social and physical relations of the race—the other moves more especially in the order of the spiritual, and reaching beyond time, draws the aspirations of the human heart beyond itself, out into the order of grace. The one *attests* itself by the physical senses, and moves backwards for the realization of its consciousness through the laws which govern the *atomic* world, and here seeks the objective data which shall govern and condition its subjective life. The other accepts revelation as in the order of the supernatural, and aspires upward and onward, making the whole order of nature as subservient to its behests. The one came into embryonic life when our fathers first began to realize the significance and meaning of these words—"*cursed* is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return to the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." The other loomed forth like the first rays of the early light, faintly radiating and casting a halo, though dimly, over the moral darkness and despair consequent upon the loss of Eden; when God said, "I will put *enmity* between *thee* and the *woman*, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

The one is, therefore, *negative*, as to the ground of its necessity; and is the legitimate offspring of the human will, staggering and struggling in vain hope for physical deliverance from the curse of God. The other is the child of promise—budding into fuller consciousness through every step of God's dealings with His people; from the first moment of its embryonic life, on through the thunderings of Sinai—in every scintillation of prophetic fire—the songs of inspiration—the priestly offices—and in all the sacrificial types and shadows, up to the coming of our Lord.

Science, on the one hand, standing in the sphere of nature, and fretted by the ceaseless changes and contradictions incident to its progress, found itself also, as it supposed, under surveillance to the order of grace; and has shown a spirit of aggressiveness, which is not only antagonistic to faith, but largely skeptical. Faith, on the other, grounding itself subjectively in the will of God, became objective only as that will manifested itself in a self-authenticating way, in the progress of history. In this sense it is especially "the gift of God." And just as the will of God unfolded itself to the human consciousness, Faith laid hold of that will, and authenticated itself again in the spirit of obedience and trust. Thus faith is, within the human consciousness, that subjective power which binds the *spiritual essence* in man to the personality of God, and is at the same time the ground of all that is progressive in his spiritual nature.

But faith has also, from the beginning, shown a captious and exclusive spirit; and largely ignoring the order of nature, has been, in relation to science, a self-contradiction—now yielding a fascinating smile for every movement in the attempt at solving nature's mysterious problems; and now again, recoiling within its own abstract judgment, has sought, by every possible means, to crush each progressive step on the part of science towards such solution.

The constitution of nature and the order of grace, the respective spheres of Science and Faith, are primarily antagonistic also. And when Paul, baffled in his heavenly aspirations, confessed that an incessant warfare waged its conflicts between the will of the flesh and the will of the spirit, he uttered a truth which not only finds a counterpart in the experience of every honest heart, but a truth which all history, echoing from the graves of more than six thousand years, clearly attests to all, save those who stand so completely in the order of nature as to have no conception of life's conflicts beyond the natural.

But, though primarily antagonistic, the mission of science and that of faith lead in the same path, and have ultimate y a common hope, viz, *the problem of truth.*

What is truth? This is a question which has confronted the human mind since its first awakening in the sphere of thought. And having defied and put to shame the dogmatic struggles of Judaism, the intellectual developments of Asia, the philosophical and æsthetic culture of Greece, and the legalistic and forensic achievemnts of ancient Rome, it is not surprising that when God became incarnate and walked among men, He should have been confronted with the same question: "What is truth?"

Truth is *relative* and at the same time *absolute.* In the order of nature it is only relative; in the order of grace it is absolute. In its pursuit, Science and Faith, in all ages, have been assiduously at work; and especially before the time of Christ, joining hand-in-hand with Philosophy, and exhausting the whole range of human thought, vainly hoped for its solution. But *philosophy,* apart from a true apprehension of God's subjective character and objective power and grace, was equally abortive. Now moulded largely by the vague and crude scientific notions of the earlier ages, and now modified by the transcendental and idealistic character of their faith, it was at one time carnal and selfish, leading its votaries into the lowest scale of corruption and vice; and again, passing over into the ideal and mythical, so ignored nature as to turn it into a farce, and tangent-like, became lost, absolutely lost in abstraction.

Thus Science, in the sphere of relative truth, and Faith, in the sphere of truth absolute, during the shadowy adumbrations of the ante-Christian period, (even by the aid of the highest order of philosophical thought,) failed utterly as to any right conception of *the truth.* "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground," clearly indicates a condition of subordination, both for the individual and the race; and now, in the light and experience of more than six thousand years, clearly attesting its realization in the sad strugglings of every human heart, leaves no longer any room to doubt that the sphere of man's physical and intellectual activity lies within the order of *relative truth*, and that of himself he can never transcend it. And hence, every effort, whether in the form of purely scientific research, or the more masterly strides of unaided reason, to solve in the order of *relative truth* the problem of truth absolute, has only been speculative, and fatally false.

And just here is the "Charybdis" into which many of our most eminent scientists of to-day are hurling themselves with a sad fatality. Proudly may we contemplate the achievements of Tyndall, Darwin, Draper, Mr. Spencer and others, in the sphere of scientific research. Their labors shall stand after themselves shall have been forgotten, as monuments of toil and intellectual greatness, and shall wonderfully assist in the solution of many intricate problems awaiting scientists in years to come; but just as they are great in Science, so are they also weak in all that relates to Faith, and their philosophical deductions, conditioned largely by facts and principles which address themselves to the physical senses only, are materialistic and false.

Indeed, up to the present, such has been the tendency of Science generally; and so it must remain, unless sanctified by a higher sense of the supernatural. Without presuming to enter the arena of Absolute Truth, but leaving that to be determined as a logical deduction from its observations, Science has been largely one-sided, and in all its investigations has tended to magnify *nature* as such

Nor is this surprising! for standing, now, amid the colossal structures of inorganic nature, and tracing the results of its inherent laws and forces, as stamped upon the lofty hills and written indelibly upon the vulcan rocks, thousands of feet beneath the earth's surface—analyzing the simplest grain of sand, and then tracing it in all its transformations up to the wonderful beds of granite, and there reading its lessons of attraction and cohesion; science has been overwhelmed with the grandeur and beauty of nature's laws.

So also, in studying the wonderful and complex structures of animal and vegetable organic life—whether from the highest form in man, and then down through the animal kingdom, with its countless modifications in form, adaptation and structure, to the animalcules, floating by thousands in a single drop of water:—or the vegetable kingdom; from the lofty pine, towering upwards until it almost penetrates the clouds, its sear leaflets catching the breeze and in mournful tones singing a requiem to nature's weary repose—the lofty oak, with out-stretched arms and deeply penetrating roots, bidding defiance to tempest and to storm—the ivy and the hyssop, leaning in graceful proportions upon hillock and rock—the flowering plants, sparkling in richest hues beneath the sunlight, and wafting their fragrance out upon the air—and thence down through the trailing arbutus, to the lowest forms of vegetable life in the mosses, and the mould of decaying wood; science stands in worshipful delight before this world of grandeur and beauty. And tracing at the same time the laws and forces here operative—from the most complex structure down to the simple or primordial cell, which is the ultimate form of all life product—its simplicity in form and structure, its physiological laws and forces, and its *remarkable* simplicity, alike as to its chemical and atomic properties, Science supposes it has exhausted the whole range of possibilities, and in its vain imaginations thinks it has here comprehended not only the *principle of life*, but the ground also of truth; and proudly exclaims, eureka!

But the primordial cells of vegetable life are so uniformly alike, that studied by the closest process of observation yet available for the human mind, the future development of the species may not be determined by these cells themselves. So also of the granular or nucleated cell of animal organic life. Its character is uniform for many species; and though, by the process of chemical analysis, its constituent properties are well understood; and by the powerful aid of the microscope, every modification and change through which it passes in the process of development is familiar to the scientist, as are the functions of the future organism itself; still by no properties or laws inherent to matter as such, has the wonderful process of life been predicated.

No one, however materialistic, has yet been so foolish as to regard life, or the life process, as the result of attraction, cohesion, gravitation, affinity or even assimilation—for this presupposes a power and force which cannot be predicated of any known law or property of matter itself.

That matter, in its primitive form, is eternal, both as to the past and the future, is more than probable; for we may not conceive of the Eternal God, in His subjective power and glory, without an objective medium through which He is active. Still, in studying the life process, developing itself on every hand in and through matter—its uniform order and design—its gradation upwards in the order of a grand purpose—its relative and correlative adaptation to perpetuity, and its wonderful physiological laws and forces—Faith joins issue with Science in all its materialistic tendencies; and in a grand "*Te Deum*," unites with the lawgiver of old—"in the beginning," that is to say, in the beginning of the *present* order and constitution of nature, "God created the heavens and the earth."

But *Faith*, though born thus to a heavenly heritage, has itself not maintained a spotless and virgin-like purity before the world. Though essentially positive in character, and destined when *properly grounded*, to lead unerringly in the sphere of truth; it has been a self negation—now bursting out with the effulgence of heavenly light, and now descending into deeds of darkness. Now rising as by inspiration, it has led men to yield themselves as willing sacrifices at the stake; and now itself has become the spirit of a persecution, bloody and unrelenting. Now soaring aloft, and kindling with a heavenly flame the hearts of God's people, it has found expression in worship and praise; in architecture, in sculpture, in painting, and in all the æsthetic movements of which the human mind is capable; and now again, with a jealous eye, has watched every effort of Science in the development of man's physical and social condition; and has unsparingly hurled upon *it*, anathemas fearful and vehement. And indeed, scarcely has Science made a step in the sphere of real progress, without encountering its resistance.

Thus, in these long centuries, has the human mind in the pursuit of truth had a ceaseless conflict—"the will of the flesh against the will of the spirit."

But notwithstanding this antagonism, primarily, between Science and Faith, the whole order and constitution of nature look upwards in the direction of the supernatural; and never attain to any significance, until complemented by a proper sense of the Jehovah. And without, here, discussing the chronological order of creation, as usually and literally attributed to Moses; but presuming that he was dealing with general facts, rather than attempting any scientific exposition of them; the accuracy of his account, both as to order and design (studied especially in the light of the remarkable revelations science has recently made on this subject) is alike wonderful and grand.

Beginning with the vegetable kingdom, in the order of life; its process unfolding itself in regular gradation, from the lowest form of the vegetable—supplemented also, from time to time, by a corresponding type of the animal, up through a period probably of many thousands of years—was a constant struggle upwards, each stadium supplemental to, but dependent upon that which went before, until finally, it reached its highest order in man. And here again, with head erect—with beauty and symmetry of form—and endowed not only with wonderful physical resources, but incomprehensible moral and intellectual power and force, he stands, at once the peculiar and crowning glory of creation.

As the inorganic world unfolded itself in its successive stadia, as a passive nidus not only for the vegetable, but for the energies and activity of animal life; so the whole order of nature is but the objective expression of a power and force which lies behind it—a power and force which some of our most eminent scientists of to-day, (here only repristinating the views and notions of scientists many centuries ago) even in the light of much experience, attribute to some essential quality inherent to, or accidental to, the molecules of matter itself.

But Faith accepts no such conclusions. Standing midway between the finite and the infinite, it reads in every step of the creative process, from the first vibrations of "molecular contact," through every law and force of development, and up through all the wonderful phenomena of vegetable and animal organic life, an intelligent *design,* before which it bows in humble but grateful homage. And transcending, at the same time, that sphere of intelligence and thought inherent to the physical senses only—that sphere beyond which the mere student of nature may never attain —it reaches back beyond the limits of time, and out into the eternal now; and as it is apprehended, so it apprehends, in all this, a power in no sense inherent to matter, nor accidental to it; but a power supernatural, viz: *the will of God.*

In our reference to Science, so far, we have regarded it as standing purely in the Order of Nature, as such, and conditioned as it largely has been, and always will be until it comes to assume a christological character, by facts and principles interpreted by unaided reason only. So also of Faith. In all its strugglings after truth, and in the conflicts and revolutions which time and again have hurled *it* from its true path, it has been falsely grounded. Though in its very nature of divine origin, it has been in the past, and is even now so largely conditioned by the purely psychological attributes of man's own nature, that it has been intensely arbitrary and selfish. Now, moulded in the fashion of dogmatic ultraism, it is necessarily dictatorial and exclusive. Traditional notions and precepts here rise before the human consciousness as with a divine majesty; and the slavish subjugation of the individual will holds the energies of the human mind in such fearful subordination, that Science, and even the arts, tremble at every step of their legitimate progress. Here the dead past, with all its sarcophagi of obsolete notions, is held as if in perennial freshness—and here, it were sacrilegious, if in the lofty strides of astronomical investigation, or in the more humble, but infinitely more important researches amid the bowels of the earth, or in the physiological forces and laws of animal organic life, aught should transpire in contravention of the notions of the fathers. All such faith is stagnant of progress; and whilst it holds its subjects with an iron grasp, it condescends in no familiar greetings for the patient but earnest strugglings of the human will, in the problem of man's physical and social redemption.

Or, assuming the purely subjective character of fanatical *pietism*, it sweeps over the domain of human destiny with an arrogance and pride, before which the glory even of chivalry may bow in silent shame.

Here, Faith joins hands with Science in being largely human. The feelings, the emotions, and even the baser passions, condition its laws; and the *individual* rises in self-importance until, ignoring all authority, he becomes in the sphere of absolute truth a law unto himself. Such, indeed, is the *rationalism* which to-day walks not only in high places, but is casting its venomous influence with an open hand into our homes, around our fire-hearths. It skulks nauseously beneath the captions of many of our religious papers—flashes with the speed of lightning from continent to continent—infuses its spirit into our colleges and schools—breathes throughout almost every line of our polite literature—conditions the type and character of our Sunday-school books—and, riding contemptuously over the *person* of Christ, with an air of arrogant presumption self-interprets His words and precepts into a fanciful dream; and thus human reason, if not a mere caprice of feeling, is the shibboleth here, in the sphere of truth absolute.

Demonstrative and inductive thought, as it unfolds itself in the province of *relative truth*, is largely conditioned by the higher and speculative functions of the human mind, as it apprehends the supernatural in its relations to the order of nature. And just how far the *prevailing faith* of the age may be responsible for the materialistic tendencies of inductive thought, as it finds expression in the observations of Tyndall, Darwin, Mr. Spencer and others, should be the subject for earnest consideration.

But for you, gentlemen, there is a higher and nobler heritage. Born of a Faith which is purely christological, the dead issues of *arbitrary authority*, and the ghostly spirit of a *subjective pietism*, sink alike beneath the plane of your observation.

As the human mind, shaping the destinies of nations and people from the earliest hours of patriarchal life up to the present moment, has in no sense been independent or absolute, but only *relative* in the various stages of its activity; so no nation has stood independent of others, or served an end peculiarly its own.

From the hour when, amid the tranquil scenes and associations of Eden, God said: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" human life was, up to the coming of Christ, a perpetual scene of struggling activity. And whether studied in its unfoldings, as finally wrought out under the *types* and *shadows* of Judaism, the intellectual struggles of Asia, the philosophical and ethical character of Greece, the pomp and military glory of ancient Rome, or the baser passions of barbarism; *reciprocal* influences, wrought by invasion and conquest, by commerce and trade, gave to the whole *organic race* a restless discontent, and longing after something in the future. In this vain struggle, however diversified its factors, history was but the record of human triumph and disappointment in the effort at solving its own destiny.

But amid all this confusion there came looming up, like the scintillations of electric power, beautifully but faintly illuminating the distant sky, the rays of a slender hope from the memories of Eden, in these words: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." This hope, by God's fuller revelation of Himself to His covenanted peeple, became to them the ground of Faith; but was at the same time also a potential hope for the organic race. And thus, whilst Faith in the order of God's covenanted relations to His people was positive in its teachings, the moral, the intellectual, the social, the commercial, and even the æsthetic powers and energies of the organic race, if not positively at least negatively, were but one grand movement by way of preparation for the central world-fact in the sphere of truth absolute, viz: the Incarnation of the Son of God.

And so also from the first vibrations of "molecular contact" in nature, sprung into activity amid the realms of chaos by the will of God—whether in the sun, the moon, the myriads of stars; or in this beautiful earth, from its first evidences of attraction and cohesion, up through the thermal and aqueous deposits, the secondary and tertiary rocks, the beautiful crystals, and wonderful beds of metals and coal, the liquid gases which illuminate our streets, and in a thousand ways serve the arts, our alluvial soil with its myriads of plants, its shrubbery and its trees, and in the whole order of vegetable and animal organic life, not a law or a force, not even a result, serves an end for itself; but the whole constitution of nature stands thus in the order of development, and indicates a grand fact to which it has not yet attained.

Physical nature looks, therefore, beyond itself for completion, and complements that subjective energy and longing, inherent to man's moral nature, for the apprehension of the problem of truth absolute.

But in its interpretation of nature's laws, Science has, so far, largely failed of its high prerogative; and though it has almost annihilated space, and brought the planetary system within its range of observation—though it has calculated the nature and velocity of light, the density and structure of the heavenly bodies—though it has demonstrated the nature and quality of the dew-drop which sparkles on the blade of grass, and of the breeze which wafts it again amid the sunbeams—though it has satisfactorily accounted for the phenomena of the winds and tides, and caused the gulf stream to yield up the secret of its mysterious march—though science *has* taken the lightning in its hand, and belting the earth with its silvery flash, has caused continent to embrace continent in familiar grasp—and though it has traversed the whole range of vegetable and animal organic life, and unfolded their mysteries as a scroll—in all this, no real achievement has yet been made here towards the solution of the problem of man's true destiny. The conflict between progress and decay is steadily at work, and until Science reaches out beyond itself, acknowledging its subordination, as in the sphere of relative truth only, and apprehends, as does Faith, in the supernatural, the *ground* for its observations, it must utterly fail in comprehending the significance or meaning of nature's laws. God manifest in the flesh, is the glorious hope of struggling nature, and the solution also of the problems of truth relative and truth absolute. Here is a revelation, answering at once the highest demands of Science and of Faith. In the order of nature, and yet infinitely above it—a mystery, and yet a reality—the finite and the infinite in organic union—Christ stands as the central fact for all history. In the constitution of His person—in the calm and even tenor of His life—and in His majestic control over the ordinary laws of nature, He not only invests those laws with significance and meaning, but is at once also the interpretation of every positive force in nature, from the earliest moment of "molecular movement," up to the consummation of its perfection, in the grand and incomprehensible phenomena of dynamic and intellectual force, in the order of human organic life.

Here then, in the person of Christ, as the embodiment of the Divine and human, is not only the ground and source of true Faith, but the perfection of all that belongs to nature. Here is the keynote for the solution of nature's mysterious problems—here the ground for order out of confusion, and in the development of which Science and Faith *must cease* to be *antagonistic.* Here in this mystery, as it radiates its light out into the dark, and otherwise impenetrable future, Faith finds its subjective ground and objective authority—not as apart from nature, nor yet independent of it, but through nature apprehending the supernatural in its relations to the natural. Thus grounded, Faith ceases to be dictatorial and exclusive; but with a true charity, which reaches back into the the depths of man's organic relations to nature, and with a profound sympathy for his purely physical conflicts with the world, it is at the same time positive and uncompromising in its apprehension of that which is above nature.

So also of Science: when it ceases to be constructive, and becomes more analytic—when it comes to interpret nature and nature's laws, from the stand-point of their highest perfection, as they have been apprehended in the centralization of the finite and the infinite in the person of the Son of God—it will bow its haughty spirit, and in worshipful admiration join in the angelic song, "Glory to God in the highest.''

The highest order of perfection in the universe of nature, is found in the assumption of human nature by the Divine. Here all antagonism ceases, and man's *potential* deliverance, intellectual and physical, from the bondage of *truth relative,* is complemented by the embodiment of truth absolute in the person of "our Lord." "*I am* the light of the world," comes with a moral power and force, before which all speculative thought fades like the evening twilight.

Apprehending thus in the person of Christ the embodiment of physical and spiritual perfection, Science and Faith join hands in loving embrace; then start, respectively, on their missions. Faith, following "our Lord" through His life of suffering, catches inspiration from every noble deed—flashes into brighter consciousness under every word which falls from His sacred lips—lingers, in sad hope, around the tragic scenes of His death—and awakens to self-consciousness, joyfully exclaiming, "My Lord!" and "My Master!" as He comes again from the dead, walks among men, and then, in His human-Divine person, ascends to the right hand of the Father. Here the finite and the infinite stand in indissoluble union; and Faith, apprehending the *supernatural,* challenges man's moral and intellectual power with the assurance of a destiny beyond this life.

Science, standing also in a right consciousness, under the inspiration of Faith, starts also—not in the highest "order of intellectual force," as the result of "atomic vibrations," nor yet in the complex but interesting phenomena of animal organic life, as the "unfolding simply of a primordial cell," according to certain laws and forces "inherent to the molecules of matter as such," but in the *grand world-fact*, God manifest in the flesh—comes at once to a realization of its divine mission. Here, Science, though standing in the order of nature, and traversing the whole range of organic and inorganic matter as the spheres of its operations, unfolds itself also amid the highest range of intelligence and thought, and aspires upwards for man's physical and social deliverance. Thus elevated by the divine presence, science not only unfolds the nature of the laws inherent to matter on every hand, but so modifies and controls them, as that they shall be subservient to man's true destiny.

In this *christological* sense, and in this sense only, can we ever realize the enthusiastic anticipations of Draper, whether in the sphere of physical or intellectual science. And, out of Christ as the centre of all truth, there is a *farcical bombast* in these words of another—"Away with that theosophic notion, that there is a boundary across which scientific thought can never step, a vail, which it can never lift, behind which the arcana of life must lie concealed forever."

A vail, *dark as the impenetrable night*, does hang around the moral and intellectual apprehensions of man. But when Science in the sphere of "truth relative," and Faith in the sphere of "truth absolute," complement each other as standing in the person of Him who said, "*I am* the way, the truth and the life," their mission will be that of true progress.

In the accomplishment of this work for Science and Faith, each of us has a personal and high calling.

God's eternal purpose will be solved in the problem of man's destiny; and if we are awake to our duty, well for us; but if in the spleen of unbelief, or in the spirit of a masterly indifference, "we clog the wheels of progress, we shall simply be *crushed* beneath them."

The manifest destiny of the race is physical and spiritual regeneration. And when man shall so apprehend God's physical laws, operative in nature around him, and embodied in himself, as going hand in hand with the higher laws of his spiritual nature, he will rise in true majesty and greatness.

"And imbued *only* with the sense of a glorious destiny, how will not the evils of our present moral and physical degeneration yield to the power and strength of a new heritage?"—and thus in the spirit of a true "historical development" rush forward to the realization of millennial glory.

The words of Tennyson in relation to the old year have a broader significance than he gave them; and with a prophetic beauty, sweetly in harmony with this general thought, sound like the ring of pure metal.

"Ring out, wild bells, the dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife.
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

"Ring out false pride in place and blood,
The civic slander, and the spite;
Ring in the love of truth and right—
Ring in the common love of good.

"Ring out old shapes of foul disease—
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold—
Ring out the thousand wars of old—
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

"Ring in the valiant men, and free;
The larger heart, and kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land;
Ring in *the Christ that is to be.*"

"And when in future generations that harp of a thousand strings," now sadly in discord, "shall be found in tune throughout the whole range of harmony;" touched by the hand of God, "how will not this world be filled with music, and every power of soul and body be a song of praise!"

Angels, descending from the throne of God, will catch inspiration from this new earth; and with a song, like unto that when the morning stars sang together, will herald back to heaven the glorious news—"Man is physically and spiritually saved."

Art. III.—ON SPIRITUALISM.

BY REV. HENRY CARPENTER.

I leave to the spiritualist to define what is Spiritualism, while I accept the term in its common and popular sense. To attempt a definition, would be as idle as to give a permanent shape to a shifting surface of cloud. Is it an art? Is it a science? Is it a religion? Is it any or all of these? To me let it remain as I have ever seen it—a small isolated continent rising out of the sea of modern thought, distinct from art, from science, from religion, yet related to each in turn; like the Isle of Man, looking out on three kingdoms, and belonging to none. Viewed in whatever light, Spiritualism has been approached and treated by various speculators in one of two ways—either in play or in earnest. To discuss the practice, as a mere bagatelle, would be quite beyond the province and intentions of this paper. Leaving out of sight the frivolous drawing-room recreations of silly women and sillier men, I rather desire to follow the men who, often in error, are oftener in earnest than their accusers; who despise what is sordid, mercenary and mechanical; who chase through spiritual and super-terrestrial regions the illusions of a glory which they fail to realize on earth.

How has this form of imaginative faith been born among us? Dr. Johnson said on his tour in Cornwall that the farther he went West, the more he felt assured that the wise men came from the East. In the present instance, however, this new revelation has dawned on the world from the rich, wild wonder-land of the West. First of all, the European has been partially absorbing to itself the Indian element in America; and the Saxon in the process of absorption has incorporated into his ideas, language and religion, many of the half-forgotten and expiring beliefs of the ancient and imaginative rover of the prairies. The English settler on this side of the Atlantic has passed into new conditions of existence, under the action of another climate and soil; in some respects, here and there, he has become both physically and spiritually *Indianized.* In the old Indian religions, which were eminently spiritualisms, I have often thought we may discover one source which has largely fostered, if it has not originated, this ethereal persuasion, which has encouraged this bold advance into the spirit-world and the pretended commerce with its invisible inhabitants. Again, in every quarter of the intellectual world, science has year by year penetrated further into the realms of the unknown, has explored the secret depths of matter, has unfolded the law beneath the law, has lifted the veil of nature and shown the trembling children outside that what they had been taught to believe was the immediate working of the Divine Hand was after all some undiscovered principle of organic life, some unrecognized source of material activity; and thus the spiritual world has (so to speak) been driven farther and farther away from us, while the aching heart and bewildered fancy, shaken from their old retreat, have taken flight into more distant territories, unprofaned by the feet of such daring investigation. This unceasing and uncontrollable desire to enter every field of inquiry has roused many to "rush in where angels" would almost "fear to tread," to force open the recesses (if it might be) of the Divine secrets, and in a spirit of lawless and shallow curiosity, not to wait outside, but to try to peep under the door of that Holy of Holies which death is preparing to unlock to us all.

Another cause may have contributed to the growth of this real or fanciful faith; I mean, the decline in many quarters of a robust and healthy spiritual faith among Christians. The instinct of worship can never be wholly rooted out of any man, and therefore when religion declines, its vacant place is quickly filled by superstition, which is the base-born sister of faith. As far as may be discerned, these appear to me to be some of the fostering principles of Spiritualism:—the dying out of the Indian; the advance of materialism; the decline of reverence; the revival of superstition.

Though this may not be a problem of the first importance, it may nevertheless demand some attention from the sage and the priest: the Church of Science and the Church of Faith may fairly discuss its merits. How does it present itself to these two classes of thought? The former will prefer to review spiritualism from its mechanical, the latter from its moral side.

Scientifically considered, it is well known that until a law of nature or a principle of physical force is properly known or ascertained, its operation has been referred to some special supernatural cause. The monk in his cell, with crucible and retort and the appliances of his chymic art, was pronounced by the unreasoning multitude to be a magician. Roger Bacon, and many more, once heretics and sorcerers, are now savans and discoverers. In many branches of modern science we are but infants at play, and especially in such as that of animal magnetism and elrctro-biology. As soon as the principles of nervous life and physical sensation shall be more clearly understood, the wonder will cease; spiritualism will pass into higher science and higher religion; and the vapours of superstition will dissolve in the clear light of truth. How solid bodies can be made to rise and transfer themselves to appointed places; how human beings can be endowed with new powers, float round an apartment, pass through an open window, glide in mystic flight over a midnight lawn, as one spiritualist has been solemnly declared to have done, still remains for scientific explanation. Even this, by way of example, may receive a short comment in passing. It is now two or three years since a celebrated master of legerdemain appeared in England and attracted large assemblies by his marvelous performances. At the close he offered to his audience a solution of the vaunted miracles of so-called Spiritualism. By the aid of a very slight support placed under the arm of his daughter, he raised her body from the ground and placed it in a horizontal posture, and then explained how the human frame under certain conditions can be lifted and even propelled through the air, by the principles of animal magnetism and other purely material influences. There are few of us who have not received from eye-witnesses the well-authenticated accounts of solid substances being elevated by certain magnetic action, and set in motion by a superior will, apart from all manual contact. Rather than dispute these statements, I will pass to a higher and more spiritual form of the same ethereal science.

Who will altogether deny the strange potency

> "Of woven paces and of waving hands;"

—the mesmeric sleep, the far-darting vision of the seer, who, falling into a trance, yet having the eyes open, has described the distant scene and unraveled the secret, unfathomable thought. Rising into regions higher and more spiritual, how difficult is it for us to determine how far the soul can release herself at special seasons from her fleshly fetters, and passing out of the prison walls of darkening clay, may escape for one bright, brief interval into her native sphere, in which all thoughts and things reach the emancipated spirit no longer as before through the dull avenues of sense!

Some say that gleams of a remoter world visit the soul in sleep.

How little is revealed to us of the laws which govern the spirit's inner life; how little known of its manifold and complete relations to the existences and ideas and suggestions which may visit the heart from the silent and shadowy kingdoms unseen and unsearchable by us, as men! The science of physiology has yet to be written and read; till then, what emphatic verdict may we pronounce on those unearthlike tales—the faint whispers from spirit-land, which come to us now and again, through the believers in "second sight?" Little as we know of the limitations which bound the intercourse of a soul with its Creator, still less may we know of the secret intercommunion which may be possible between spirit and spirit, soul and soul. To the vision of every devout philosopher of life, as he turns his impassioned gaze toward the hidden springs of the Real and the True, there is presented around the throne of the invisible God, a world with life more real, more true, more certain than all the passing shows and semblances which cheat and delude; and to him the universe itself is a hill of Dothan, alive with intelligence and power; to his eye, millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep. This will be admitted by all except by the thoroughly gross and materialized intellect. I might perhaps advance a step further, and assert with the poet and the priest, that there passes between ourselves and the unseen an unspeakable intercourse, silently and unconsciously conducted through Him who is Lord of Nature and Head of His Church, Mediator and the one living *Medium* between innumerable spirits united and associated with Himself, Who is the Beginning and End of all. And here it is that the man of science and religion must leave the Spiritualist, presuming, as he does, to discover new means of communication, and dictating the conditions under which such intercourse is possible.

It is well that God has invited us to summon even Himself before the bar of human judgment; that he encourages His children to arraign His conduct, and decide on the dispensations of His providential wisdom. Be it granted, then, for a moment, that the boasted revelations of spiritualism were fully confirmed and established as being messages from the Divine Himself:—yet what, after all, is their practical value? Look into the past history of the sober and real revelations on which Christians build their faith, and one prominent aim is ever present. Their object was to disclose in a variety of ways the will and wish of the Deity, to explain each attribute which made Him the Friend and Father of the world, to lift man out of the sea of circumstance and passion in which he strives, to gild the darkness of his present with the hopes of futurity. Not one of these or any other imaginable aim of a Divine revelation is realized by the pretended phenomena of Spiritualism. Have we learned one new hint to brighten the page of everlasting love? Have these celestial couriers brought us any tidings to deepen the old impressions left on the heart of the world by centuries of evangelization? What new paths have been opened to entice our tardy spirits toward a neglected Paradise? Or can it be supposed that the Almighty has put up this new and hitherto unemployed spiritual machinery as a great supernatural toy, for the amusement and edification of a few refractory children, without adding to such miraculous displays of power a single new sentence in the gospel of mercy? Is this like the action of a God? The *media* employed by the Creator were men of superior moral power of deep religious belief, strong in their aspirations after the Divine. Can this be said in many instances of the "chosen vessels" of Spiritualism? The gifts and utterances of the genuine spiritualists of yore were unpurchasable; their revelations were made for one grand purpose, and distributed without money and without price. When is it that these latter-day gospels are not gilded with the gold which opens them? They are not what Christianity has ever been, the open secret of God. Of what good are they? If men hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

Nevertheless there are not a few among professed spiritualists, who feel what many of their antagonists have never known—the insatiable thirst after the living God, which has marked some of the evangelists of this transcendental religion as endowed with other faculties than those of the hireling fanatic and the wonder-working quack. For these, as for every devout enquirer into the secrets of heaven, is not the earthly temple ever open, its holy oracles ever clear? Is not every bush, ay, every tree and star, on fire with God? Why need we any further witnesses? He has spoken once to his Church out of Heaven. He is gone back for one short hour into the skies. Ere long He will speak again, not through noisy tables, drawing-room planchettes, dim seances and self-acting pianos, (to the abyss with such miserable follies!) but in the clear and unmistakeable language of a healthy conscience He will speak to all who reverently approach Him, and to an age like ours, restless and fluctuating between hope and fear, and straining eagerly toward the nearer light, he will not fail to reveal Himself in the plain path of duty, not forgetful of His own invitation to inquire both night and day:—"Knock," He says, "and it shall be opened unto you."

Art. IV.—SOME LESSONS LEARNED IN THE FIRST CENTURY OF OUR NATIONAL EXISTENCE.*

BY LEWIS H. STEINER, FREDERICK, MD.

Among the festivals instituted by Moses, in accordance with the direct command of the Lord, was one involving the fiftieth year, which was to be signalized above all others by the proclamation of "liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." Then the land was to rest, and the citizens were to return to "the social order which God had first established in the state," and at the same time to be made to feel that all had alike a part in the covenant first made by Him with their forefathers. At the close of the solemn service of the day of atonement, when the high priest had completed the ceremonies—at the close of that great day of humiliation and fasting—the air throughout the land was made to vibrate with the jubilant sounds of trumpets, and the national soul that had been bewailing its sins and shortcomings in plaintive minor strains broke forth in exultant shouts and loud thanksgivings. The year of jubilee was prophetic of that future jubilee, when the saints shall be forever freed from the degrading effects of sin, and thenceforth live in the freedom of the sons of God; but the Jews hailed it with joy also on account of its immediate present benefits, in that it was the beginning of a new era in the national life, when the errors of the past having been corrected and atoned for, wrongs redressed, restoration of privileges to those from whom they had been wrested made, with spirits purified and strengthened, renewed courage and greater vigor, they might more perfectly perform the duties imposed upon them by the God of Abraham.

---

*An address delivered in Lancaster, Pa., June 29, 1875, before the Literary Societies of Franklin and Marshall College.

While no divine authority imposes the celebration of such a year of jubilee upon any other nation, yet mankind has always found benefit in carefully retrospecting its history at certain fixed intervals; and deriving fresh courage and vigor from its successes honestly obtained in the past, has advanced to meet its future with greater courage and more confident hope. Such a period of national jubilee is now before this nation. It is about entering upon the hundredth year of its existence, and as the exultant sounds of the national centennial are ready to burst forth from all parts of the land, is it not fitting that our minds should be turned to a serious retrospect of the past and a diligent discussion of the prospects of the future? There is much reason for jubilation, for devout thankfulness to Him who has brought us through trial and tribulation to our present condition, who has guided us safely through the Red Sea of war and blood and the perils of intestine disturbance. There is also much reason for earnest prayer that in the future our greatest glory should consist in the fear of God and in the love of righteousness.

Recognizing the propriety of such a national jubilee, I do not hesitate to ask the attention of this audience, composed of the active members of the Literary Societies of a College, full of the enthusiasm and ardor of youth, some of whom are now about to enter upon the active duties of life, and to *commence* a career of expected usefulness; of learned graduates who have returned to the home of their Alma Mater with hearts full of love and gratitude, and who are ready to address kindly words of encouragement to their younger brethren; of grave and dignified Professors whose toilsome lives are devoted to the preparation of young minds for the serious problems they will hereafter meet in the world, of the representatives of the energy, enterprise and beauty of this thriving city, I do not hesitate in such a presence to ask attention to a few thoughts upon "*some lessons learned in the first century of our national existence.*"

The elements which were gathered together from all parts of the globe to people and possess the territory now owned by the United States, and which under the assimilating power of the national germ were made actual living portions of the national organism, were of all possible varieties. They were induced to leave their homes by motives as widely different as their customs and languages, and yet from such a heterogeneous multitude was evolved a homogeneous life, with striking peculiarities distinguishing it from that of all other nations on the globe. No nation can rightfully claim to be the parent of the United States. Its life springs from a new germ divinely planted here and appropriating for its development whatever of energy, enterprise and virtue is possessed by those who are either by choice or birth enumerated among its citizens. Just as the animal system separates, in the process of digestion, from the food those substances that can be made available in the upbuilding and preservation of the body, making them by means of the vital power a portion of its living organism, so does a genuine national life separate from the host of those who may come under its influence such elements as may make it a full, living realization of the peculiarities of the germinal idea from which it springs. A new nation always springs from a Divine necessity, and not from any mere resolution or compact of men. A Brigham Young may secure an aggregation of fanatical followers under the banner of a quasi-religion, may invent customs and ceremonies, habits and modes of life, construct monstrous architectural enormities for the accommodation or amusement of his people, but he cnnnot create a nation. At best he is only able to keep the dissimilar elements together for awhile, until the palpable absurdity becomes apparent, and the travesty is too contemptible for continuation, when the process of disintegration—not of death, which can only take place where there has been life—becomes speedy and certain. The chemist has learned the complex constituents of living organisms, but his knowledge does not fit him to undertake the construction of such an organism. However far he may push his knowledge of the material, he finds that there is back of that yet something beyond the grasp of his re-agents and the revealing powers of his microscope, which endows what he has discovered with the high attributes of life. Efforts have been made not only by Plato and More to construct ideal governments and ideal peoples, as those of Atlantis and Utopia, but time and again bold enthusiasts have even attempted to realize similar dreams in the founding of new nations, and the result has always been the same. The undertaking has been a failure. An aggregation of man without an organic oneness of life pervading it will never form a nation, can never attain a more dignified status than that of a systematized mob, no matter how much care has been given to the elaboration of laws and regulations for its control and government. The experience of some of the colonies might be recounted in illustration of this. In some cases the colonists came here imbued, not with the spirit of religious toleration, but filled with a longing for a government that would embrace only those who could intone shibboleth in their favorite key and with their peculiar accent; in others they started with a written constitution which could only have had a home and significance where a country had grown accustomed to the restrictions and limitations of aristocratic institutions. But the intolerance as well as the aristocratic constitution proved to be foreign to the national germ which was to mould the characters and lives of men in accordance with the Republic, destined in the mysterious dispensation of Providence here to grow up and develop to wondrous maturity; and hence they were excised as morbid excrescences from the body politic.

Mulford* has well said: "The nation is an organic unity; it is not an artificial fabric nor an abstract system, but it has a life which is definite and disparate, and has a development; therefore, it has not its origin in the individual nor the collective will of man; but must proceed from a power which can determine the origin of organic being. The nation is an organic whole; but the whole, in which there is the conception of the parts, cannot be determined by the parts, since there must be the predetermination of the whole to which the parts belong; but the whole cannot determine itself, and must, therefore, proceed from a power beyond itself"

---

* The Nation, 55.

1. This lesson, then, that as the nation is an organic unit, deriving its origin *from God Himself, and necessarily destined to exhibit a life peculiar to itself*, I assert, has been taught us in the century now fast drawing to a close. Necessarily the lesson was not learned at once, but only after long struggles, fierce contentions with foreign powers, and bloody fraternal battles at home. At first preconceived notions clogged all the efforts of the early settlers. They looked with greater or less affection upon the governments they had left, and clung with more or less tenacity to the laws, usages and customs of their forefathers. The idea of separate and independent existence was only attained after severe trials in the school of adversity, when they found that at the hands of the parent government they could expect no sympathy so long as they remained in the condition of dependents. Slowly the thought of resistance dawned upon their minds, but as it became clearer and more distinct, their arms became nerved to its vigorous assertion. Resistance implied rebellion and revolution, and to this end it came at last. A few farmers at Concord and Lexington, on the nineteenth of April, 1775, struck the first blow and kindled a flame that spread throughout the land, throwing a bright light upon the situation and making the necessity of separation, although it was to be obtained only through revolution, a stern fact which must be accepted by those who would be true to their manhood, true to their duty as citizens of a nation, and true to their God. In Philadelphia, on the Fourth of July, 1776, the idea of separation found its full expression in that grand Declaration, which Americans hail as the great embodiment of their first recognition of the idea of an independent existence.

Still even this utterance looked only to freedom from foreign control, to a confederation of associated states against dangers from without. It was devoid of a suspicion that a higher, national and organic life was here to assert itself, different from anything else the world had ever known before, which was to develop into forms strange and novel, and through a vigorous youth, manifesting many of the errors of that stage of existence, finally to attain to a strength and maturity that would place it alongside of the older nations of the earth. The revolution followed, and the system of government by which it had been clogged and fettered was broken to pieces. Rebellion against Great Britain became a necessity to the full development of the idea of patriotism, and it ceased to be rebellion when "it expressed the conviction of the common people and the common will," and attained the higher dignity of a revolution. Says Rothe, as quoted by Mulford;* "Regarded abstractly, revolutions are always moral anomalies; but actually they are to be regarded as unavoidable, and therefore only apparent moral anomalies. For in human history, through the power of sin, the development cannot continue to proceed in a continuous sequence, but only through many throes and crises. The revolution, which is really the work of the nation itself, can only be regarded as such a crisis, which through external impediments becomes the condition of the maintenance of the moral life of the nation: and such a revolution therefore can only be justified when it rests on the living conviction of the people in its totality." Such a living conviction nerved the arms of our revolutionary forefathers, enabled them to withstand a long and exhausting war against the so-called mother country, and finally, under the blessing of God, to attain their independence.

But though the Declaration of Independence was based upon the asserted existence of a necessity for "*one* people to dissolve the political bonds which had connected them with another," still the oneness of the people was practically without recognition. Difficulties began to spring out of the Confederation, which menaced the prosperity that should have proceeded from independent life. Then was assembled the famous Constitutional Convention, in which deputies from the separate States were authorized to act for the whole people, and who formulated their conception of the nation as a unit in the simple but grand preamble to the Constitution they unanimously adopted on the seventeenth day of September, 1787.

We the *People* of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." Whether the full conception of the organic unity that gave the nation a right to a separate existence was then even more than suspected by these statesmen, may, without doing injustice to their heads or hearts, be readily doubted. The full recognition of great truths is a slow process.

---

*Mulford. The Nation, 152.

In fact two tendencies speedily appeared, antagonistic to each other—either of which would put an end to national life were it to obtain supremacy. The one, centrifugal in character, delighted in empty declamations on states-rights; the other, centripetal in nature, descanted on the necessity of a strong government. The former never appreciated the meaning of the declaration in the preamble to the constitution, never rose to a clear conception of the idea of the nation as an organism, and looked upon nationality as a convenient term to indicate confederation: the latter failed to appreciate the fact that the parts of an organic whole have separate and distinct functions, and that their vitality may be displayed in different ways, subject only to a general coördination and regulation. The former would have had constant self-assertion among the States, in order to establish the fact of their independence of each other: the latter would have destroyed the states, in order to gain an all-powerful centralization. The former naturally tended towards disintegration, the latter towards autocratic power, or what has been called "Cæsarism."

These tendencies have manifested themselves all through our history down to the present day; the strength of the national life has been shown in its intolerance of either, and the resolute determination it has manifested to suppress their predominance. When a party in power has shown a tendency to disregard the rights of States, the free spirit of the people has sternly rebuked it; when a gigantic rebellion was organized to overthrow the federal power and to establish individual state-supremacy, the people, by force of arms, put it down. Thus learning that Scylla presents dangers as perilous to the ship of state as those known to exist in Charybdis, true statesmen have labored to guard against both, and to steer along a middle course, as that freest from danger. The national life has been recognized as most prosperous when manifested in accordance with its own norm—when the functions of the federal government have been allowed their ligitimate play, and those of the States such exercise as may insure their individual rights. The brain must not assume the functions of the heart or stomach, much less those peculiar to the limbs, if the animal organism is to be true to the idea underlying it. And similarly, the relative functions of the federal and state governments must be performed normally, in that complete harmony which, history has shown, affords the most satisfactory exhibition of the true end and design of our national life.

As a special proof of the peculiarity of the life that pervades the nation, may be mentioned the rapidity with which the most dissimilar elements are made to harmonize when brought together under our flag, and to take on the form previously assumed by those who inherit American citizenship. Drawn to our shores by a variety of reasons, there are representatives of almost all the nations of the globe, disciples of all the religions cultivated by mankind. The assimilating power of the national vitality speedily shows itself in the incorporation of these into full citizenship. With some there is a sturdy struggle for the retention of their mother-tongue, for the manners and usage of the nations whose citizenship they have renounced, for the introduction of regulations and customs peculiar to other lands; but the result is always, sooner or later, a submergence of all these and the adoption of that which belongs to American life. The German, the Frenchman, the Northman, the English, the Irish, the Scotch, lay aside their peculiarities, become Americanized, and speedily manifest the national life into which they have become incorporated. We are an English-speaking people, but no true student can speak of us as in any sense showing forth the life that is peculiar to England. It is as foreign to us as that which prevails in France, Germany, or any other nation that has contributed to swell the tide of emigration which yearly pours in upon us from foreign shores. Our naturalized citizens speedily become as jealous of our honor as those "to the manner born." They rally to the defence of our flag when dangers within or without threaten its safety. They enter into the commercial and mechanical pursuits of our people, are found in the ranks of our professions and in the public offices of our country. And all this not as adventurers, but as citizens, who having sought incorporation, have become vitalized with the national life; grafted into the sturdy stalk, its life has permeated and made them parts—integral parts—of itself.

And this lesson has also diminished the fear that was once felt lest an influx of foreigners might be so great as to overpower and overthrow the form of government we have inherited. The power of remaining foreigners is really denied those who come here to assume citizenship, by the national life they enter into. They cease speedily not only to be foreigners in name, but also in thought, habit and custom; and hence they add to the homogeneity of the nation. And such must be the case so long as the people of this nation remain faithful to the life which God has given it; so long as they honestly, earnestly and patriotically strive to keep the nation true to its real mission.

2. *The integrity of the nation being essential to the full play of all its parts, it is incumbent upon its citizens to contend for its preservation even at peril of life and limb.* What is meant by patriotism but that the citizen should entertain a love for the *patria*, akin to that which beats in the dutiful child's heart for his *pater*, his parents in the flesh? Lieber says that it designates "that sacred enthusiasm which prompts to great exertions, and has the welfare, honor, and reputation of the country at large in view," and is founded upon "that indestructible sympathy and attachment which every uncorrupted heart feels toward its own country." There is a pseudo philanthropy which demands credit for itself because it ignores any special claims of family and country, and professes to be alone interested in that which concerns men as men. It asserts a catholicity of sympathy that struggles against any metes or bounds to its active labors. But when it is closely scrutinized, and the practical results of its asserted liberality carefully examined, we shall find it is nothing but shallow pretense—a miserable fraud. As well might we expect to find true parental affection in one whose time was spent in visiting her neighbors' houses and in investigating their needs and wants, while thriftlessness and misery reigned at home—whose lachrymal glands were always surcharged with tears for foreign want, while domestic suffering failed to elicit an act of kindness or a word of sympathy; as well might we expect to see the full development of Christian activity in one whose time was passed in visiting sister churches and boasting of the catholicity of his faith, while the claims of his own church upon his time and energies were ignored—whose life was frittered away in examining and eulogizing the prosperity of the fields of labor assigned to others, while those where his own duties called him to active work were totally neglected. Fidelity to family and to church require us first to be true to the duties there imposed upon us, not only before we endeavor to extend our sympathies, but in

order that we may do so with proper success. And similarily does patriotism require us to labor for our own country, whether ours by virtue of nationality or choice, in order that we may fit ourselves for the wider and broader demands of a true philanthropy, which is as different from the bogus article as the pure metal is from the counterfeit which is only a miserable imitation.

But as filial duty to cherish and protect the parent is intensified where the life of the latter absolutely depends upon its performance, so the citizen's duty to strive for a healthy, vigorous national life is heightened when the very existence of the nation is dependent upon the possession of such vitality. Here then patriotism can at all times find a field for the due exercise of all its faculties. Its proper field is not that of pride or vain-glory, where depreciation of other lands and other governments is associated with undue exaltation of the nation. Indeed true patriotism has nothing in common with hatred of other lands, any more than, to use another's words, "a man who feels deeply attached to one woman among so many thousand thereby declares that he holds her to be better, wiser, purer than all the rest." True, the exaggerated phraseology of sentimentalism, which is at best but a poor imitation of love, admits of superlative language when the beloved is the subject, and may indulge in meaningless rant ; but that love which is strongest and most enduring proceeds from *positive sympathy* for one, irrespective of all comparison of her peculiar characteristics with those of the rest of her sex. It finds its pleasure and its duty combined in its love, and is elevated by this feeling above the passion of indifference or hate towards the others. In fact, one cannot love any one object worthy of real love without, by that very fact, being made capable of appreciating whatever is lovable in the world around. True patriotism thus has no connection properly with a spirit of disparagement, but may indeed enable us "to value other countries higher in the abstract." And yet to our own nation we are bound by the sweetest tie of affection ; for her our earnest efforts must be directed to keep her in that path which will make her honored among the nations of the earth, and when need arises to leave even home and kindred, and to peril life and limb for her. Because there can be no home unless it is under the aegis of national protection, there can be no security for kindred unless it be afforded by law. There can be no protecting vine and fig-tree unless these grow up under the nurturing and fostering care of a wise, paternal government.

Nor is this idea an outgrowth of modern civilization, or a result simply of the teachings of Christianity. It is an instinct of the human heart which has been illustrated in a thousand different ways since the beginning of history. It was a heathen poet who sung

"Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori,"

and yet the sentiment finds an emphatic response in every human breast. But when this natural instinct is associated with a justifiable pride in the proper performance of the peculiar mission entrusted to a country,—where the reason finds that the instinct is not blind in its attachment to an unworthy object, but gives it approval, then the arm is nerved and the courage intensified in the citizens who are called forth to its defense.

Have we not but recently illustrated the sentiment of the American people on this subject? When the integrity of the nation was attacked, and arms were employed to ensure its disruption—when the cry for help showed how great the need was for assistance—when the demand went forth that troops should be raised to prevent the success of rebellion—what was the effect upon the peace-loving citizens of the land? Did the farmer, the mechanic, the laborer, the inventor, the man of science, the student in his library, the physician at the bedside, the lawyer at the bar, even the clergyman in the pulpit, reply "the call is not for me; I have not been trained to arms; my tastes, pursuits and education have made me a lover of peace, and given me no fitness for war?" No! but on the contrary, from the length and breadth of the loyal States was there heard an earnest entreaty from patriotic lips that they might be allowed to contend for the preservation of the Union. And so a busy, money-making people were metamorphosed into an army, undergoing the drilling and instruction that all apprentices must undergo before they become masters of a novel pursuit. Through disaster and defeat, through the blunders of ignorance and want of experience, they toiled on, until at length came success and victory. They had shown how free men could fight for a nation's flag.

Should occasion ever require a similar relinquishment of the arts of peace for the toils and perils of war, we have the right to expect that an equal alacrity will be shown by the American people—that the same patriotic spirit will nerve their hearts and strengthen their arms, as they form regiments, brigades and divisions in defence of the national flag. God grant that it may never again require, however, brothers to stand in arms against brothers, or that the people of this favored land be found on the battle field, except as soldiers under one flag, and that the flag of the Union, "one and indivisible!"

3. In order that every citizen should be fitted for the official positions to which he is theoretically elegible, it is essentially necessary that the advantage of mental education should be within his reach. The rights and privileges of citizenship in the possession of an ignorant man are as likely to be used to his own detriment or that of his associates as a razor in the hands of an infant. No prudent man would grant permission to a child to play with a loaded revolver; nor think it advisable to employ one to plan a house for him, who knew nothing of architecture; or to contract for any needed work save with those who were presumptively acquainted with such work. Trained or educated labor is demanded by the practical business man, and hence he invariably has recourse to those who have acquired skill by practice either alone or under approved masters. And as there is no pursuit, affording adequate reward to its followers, which is confined to a few, there is always room for some kind of selection among the experts. The fitness of the expert is a necessary requisite—should be the all-controlling one—to be determined before the choice is made. Where each citizen is eligible to any office, it becomes important that no one should be left in ignorance. All must be acquainted with the rudiments of knowledge, as all are liable to be called forth from the walks of private life and assigned to public duties. All should be furnished with abundant facilities for acquiring an education that would give them fitness for such duties when thus imposed upon them.

An autocracy or a monarchy may be indifferent to the education of its subjects, and may interest itself solely with the mental cultivation of the members of the aristocracy or the royal family, with possibly some few others who may be necessary to the superintendance of the wheels of government. Indeed, from a selfish stand point, they might consider education of the masses as dangerous to their own security; just as the laws of some of the slave states prohibited instruction in reading to their slaves, for fear the latter might thereby learn something of their natural rights and of the sympathy which their wrongs had excited in the world—all of which would translate them from a state of happy, stupid ignorance, to a condition of unhappy, restless, ambitious longing to better themselves and to attain to a higher and nobler manhood. The reasoning employed to defend inattention to mental cultivation is as simple as it is unsound. It runs somewhat after this order: So long as the people are supplied with what may be needed in the way of food and clothing, so long as comfortable habitations are furnished, so long as they are kept *glebæ adscriptus*, their thoughts directed only to the natural wants of the body, they will obey the orders of their rulers without question or cavil, and will lead quiet, orderly, happy (!) lives. But all this is based upon the idea that "ignorance is bliss," which being admitted, it follows as a necessary consequence that "'tis folly to be wise." Then again, there is something calculated to charm the superficial thinker in the picture of patriarchal simplicity, where the ruler occupies the parental position to the ruled, issuing his orders to his subjects with the confident assurance that they will be implicitly obeyed, taking upon himself the care of all their wants and needs, providing for them in sickness and health, and giving them no object in life higher than that of securing his approbation and good will. But such a picture is a caricature of happiness. It is simply an exhibit of that which belongs to the infantile stage of human life, and ignores the right of individual thought and individual progress and advancement. An absolute monarchy, or an absolute autocracy, or even the prevalence of slavery, is impossible where education has given a taste of the freedom and equality which is every human being's natural and indefeasible right. They are detrimental to that progress and development in knowledge which should be open and free to all. They bind to the earth him who was made in the image of his creator, they restrict to the sphere of animal life and the narrow wants of the perishable body souls destined to survive long after all that is earthly shall disappear. Hence, irrespective of the form of government of a country, the citizens as human beings are entitled to every educational advantage that may enable them to rise above the sphere of the animal and sensual, to learn the nature and uses of the forms of creation that were placed here in subjection to them, the characteristic properties of the forces of nature, the mysteries of the laws of thought and the wonderful facilities for expressing the same possessed by language. Only when the blessings of an education are ensured to a people, will they be enabled to make that progress in the useful or ornamental arts which will place them abreast of the column of humanity in its grand march over the broad plains of history.

But what is important to each individual, separately considered, in order that he may secure the best possible progress in the arena of life, becomes of national importance when there is no let or hindrance to his securing any position of authority which the suffrages of his fellow-citizens may indicate. Ignorance here is more than a personal evil; it is a public misfortune, as well as a public disgrace. No republic could survive if its office holders were selected only from the ranks of the ignorant and debased. Its law makers, its judges and executive officers, need that preliminary education which will make them able to command the stores of written knowledge, to understand the actual resources and present condition of the country, to appreciate such measures as will insure its progressive advance among other nations and to sustain in every possible way its honor and dignity. They should be selected on account of peculiar fitness for the stations they are intended to fill, and no man should be deprived of the opportunity of securing the intellectual training which will contribute to this fitness.

In full recognition of this lesson, the education of the masses has been a subject of intense interest to our nation during the last half century. While the number of higher institutions of learning has largely increased, and it has been a keen source of pleasure to men of wealth to pour out of their abundance into the treasuries of academies, colleges, and Universities, in still greater measure has the number of our common schools increased, until all over the States that are most prominent for their energy, enterprise, intelligence and wealth, school-houses have been planted, offering elementary instruction gratuitously to the children of the poor and lowly as well as to to those of their richer and more favored neighbors. From these go forth every year those who are to control the future destinies of our land, and to protect the American name from soil or disgrace. No amount of expenditure or care to make such schools sources of sound and useful knowledge can be considered too great. It is a wise, permanent investment, that must bring the most satisfactory results. The common school has already been the fountain whence some of our most distinguished statesmen have received the intellectual training that has fitted them to take commanding positions in the nation, and the American people are not likely to neglect in the future that which has given such satisfactory results in the past.

4. To prevent mere mental development from being used to execute wickedness, and that which will bring shame and ruin upon the nation, full and free opportunity must be granted, under the protection of law, to the ministers of religion to carry out their work of evangelization and moral instruction among the people. Mere mental culture, apart from high moral tone, will not necessarily result in honorable patriotic efforts, nor will it insure honesty and integrity. The cultivated scoundrel differs from the class to which he belongs only in his capacity to execute more successfully his villainous plans. All that mere mental culture can do for him is to increase his power of doing wrong in the community, to give an exquisite edge to the blade which he wields on the right and the left in pressing forward in his career of dishonesty and crime, to intensify the poison he naturally possesses so as to make it more fatal to his victims. "Whited sepulchres may attract the eye by their beautiful external appearance, possibly may not offend the nose if at a suitable distance, and yet they may be full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness." Similarly, the culture which has been wholly intellectual may command admiration for its extent and thoroughness, may charm the ear by its eloquent diction, and captivate the soul by the sublimity of its utterances, and yet be conjoined with a heart full of moral filth and corruption,—may indeed prove a very focus of contagion to a nation. Hence no culture can be considered desirable which loses sight of the moral nature of man. The true and the beautiful can have no abiding home unless when associated with the good.

But morality is unattainable unless in connection with religion, which is its groundwork and basis. And religion necessarily implies a recognition of some power outside of and above the sphere of humanity, from whence its precepts proceed and whose approval or disapproval must be looked for in every human act. Hence the nation cannot be indifferent to religion. Says Lieber on this point,* "If we comprehend within this term all belief, true or erroneous, in an agent or agents overruling the actions and destinies of men, possessed of a power surpassing human power, which extends to the changes in the physical world, we shall find that men have never existed without some religion, whether it be in the form of the grossest fetish religion, adoring beings which do not even represent real or imagined animate beings, or polytheism, or monotheism. The consciousness of our dependence and of the great limitations of our power, fear or hope, desire of superior aid, or a longing for support and comfort in adversity, which every man feels that he himself or his fellow man are incapable of affording, has invariably led men to acknowledge a superior agency of some sort or other. Man has always adored. If, therefore, there were no other reason why we should promote pure religion—and there are many indeed—this would be a strong one, that man will not and cannot live without some religion, of whatever character; and if he has not a true one he will embrace a false one; if he has not belief or true faith he will resort to superstition, or rather his heart will naturally engender it. But if a religion acknowledges a God "who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity," who is love and all-pure, it needs no farther discussion to show how deeply the whole society is interested in maintaining the diffusion of such a faith, which affords the two most powerful agents of morality; namely, on the one hand, mental communion with a being who is purity himself, and, being omniscient, does not judge by signs or outward actions, but searches the motives in the deepest recesses of our hearts, and who, being almighty, affords support to all who seek it in purity from him; and on the other hand, the belief in the immortality of the soul. It extends at once the whole sphere of action; its effects and tests go beyond the mere calculation of expediency, and thus the belief must needs become the most powerful primitive impulse to good actions, uprightness, disinterestedness, kindness, love of truth, and admiration of what is truly good, beautiful, noble and great."

---

*Lieber's Political Ethics, II., 67.

Still the cultivation of religion pure and undefiled is not the province of the nation *per se.* It belongs to the Church—another divine institution, possessed of peculiar powers through its great Head, which are manifested in the entire renovation of sinful nature and the impartation of a spiritual life to the penitent human being. But the Church is not dependent upon the State, although the latter owes its most perfect and successful development to the purity of life, which the influence of the former bestows upon its faithful members. Hence it is necessary that the Church should be protected by the State in all its legitimate efforts to extend the influence of the truths entrusted to it for the good of mankind; that it should be allowed free scope in the work of evangelization and moral instruction among the people, because the best kind of citizens are those who are sincere followers of Christ.

The protection furnished by the State must not be in the form of subsidy or pecuniary support, which would place the Church in a dependent position, but rather by prohibiting every thing that would interfere with the due exercise of its functions. Thus it is right that there should be Sunday laws, so that those who wish to keep the day in accordance with their interpretation of the divine command may not be subjected to interruption by the noise of business or pleasure. It is right that severe penalties should be imposed for disturbance of divine worship, that the clergy should be exempted from certain civil duties which might interfere seriously with the due performance of their professional functions, that the church in some form be recognized as the guardian of morality. This can be done without discriminating between the different denominations that claim to be alike sharers of her high prerogatives and privileges.

Where the question arises in regard to religions that are not Christians, and the followers of some of these are to be found in our country—"How far can the government render them protection?" the answer must be: only so far as their services are not disturbances of public order, and their teachings not subversive of morality and good citizenship. The Christian Church, if true to the teachings of her Master, cannot ask that law be used to suppress other forms of religion, but must rejoice at the opportunity of bearing the truth to the followers of such, in full confidence that the seed thus planted will yield a rich reward for their labor. The fanatics and hyper-pietists, who wished to drive the Chinese from our shores for fear that they would paganize an essentially Christian land, only showed by their conduct how weak was their faith in the power and vitality of the Christian religion. Far different was the spirit of those who hailed the influx of the Chinese as affording them an opportunity for earnest evangelical labor under the protecting ægis of a government that has learned not to despise the religion upon which its founders relied for strength, and whose teachings can only result in creating the highest type of citizenship.

These are some of the lessons learned by the American people during the first century of national existence. They do not contain any novelties, but are simple rehabilitations of truths that have always existed. Truth is never new save to him who meets with it for the first time, when it has the charm of novelty. It may be hidden from observation for years or centuries, but such concealment does not tend to its decay. Ever fresh and living to him who finds it, he will never go astray who follows its guidance; but great will be the condemnation of him to whom the light of truth is revealed in vain. To sin against light and to plunge into deliberate blindness will bring its own terrible punishment. In proportion as we profit by the lessons taught us in the past shall we advance to the forefront of the nations of the earth, not only in strength and wealth, but also in those higher characteristics which give durability to a national name and fame. We must never lose sight of these lessons, for if a nation becomes oblivious of its divine mission, of the imperative demands of patriotism on its citizens, of the need of intellectual culture to raise it above the plane of the animal, and of the importance of that moral and religious training which recognizes this life as but a preparation for another of eternal duration, then its downfall and utter ruin will be a mere matter of time. It will speedily become a prey to the spoiler from without, or to inevitable destruction from dissensions and divisions at home. Continual vigilance is essential to the durability of any nation, and abiding attachment to truth is sure passport to a green old age.

It is proper, however, before dismissing the subject, to glance briefly, for time will admit only of a brief retrospect, at some peculiar results or successes attained by the nation during its first hundred years, not for the purpose of vain glory, but to show that imperfectly as we have learned the lessons already mentioned, still they have borne rich and abundant fruit. Progress of an unexampled character has marked our history. While we would avoid the excessive laudations of American optimists, it cannot be wrong to shun the dispiriting jeremiads of the disciples of the pessimist school, and to glance at the actual results of our history.

1. *Population.*—At the breaking out of the revolutionary war it is estimated that there were 2,083,000 (including 500,000 slaves,) men, women and children living in the thirteen colonies. How many of these were natives and how many of foreign birth it is impossible to state, nor is there any certainty as to the correctness of the number, since it is the result of conjecture and not of an actual census-enumeration. When the first census, however, was taken in 1790 the number is given as 3,929,214, which presents a strong contrast to the grand total 38,558,371 as furnished by the census of 1870. Assuming that the increase from 1870 to the present has been at the same rate as between 1860 and 1870, we may reckon the present population of the United States as nearly 42,000,000, in other words nearly twenty-one times more than when the oppressive measures of the English government drove the people into rebellion. Then thirteen colonies along the Atlantic coast constituted the nucleus. They were thinly settled and poorly provided with means of inter-state intercourse. Now there are thirty-eight States stretching across the broad continent, one of which is almost an empire itself on the shores of the Pacific, with a population drawn from all quarters of the globe, developing signs of the national spirit and enterprise wherever a settlement is made, and building up populous towns and cities in an almost incredibly short space of time. That which was formerly our extreme west has become the east to the Chinese, Japanese and other oriental nations.

The singular rapidity with which the foreign element becomes Americanized is as startling as the numbers in which it appears. For a while some of them may contend for their national rites and customs, may pride themselves upon their foreign origin, but they sooner or later succumb to the prevailing spirit and esteem it a high privilege to be American citizens. Their children claim to be Americans by birth and care not to push their genealogies beyond the country which they find so congenial to prosperity and enterprise. Even the peculiar physical characteristics belonging to the countries whence the fathers came, are gradually disappearing and giving place to a type peculiar alone to the United States, so that with a singular conglomeration of surnames indicating cosmopolitan origin, our population generally presents uniform physical and mental peculiarities.

2. *Valuation of Property.*—Here the data are very inadequate to a comparative statement of what has been done in the century, but we can compare the valuation of the property of the country, exclusive of that belonging to the general government, as presented by the census of 1870, with that of 1850. The latter was stated to be $7,135,780,228, and the former $30,068,518,507; in other words, the wealth of the country, in the twenty years intervening between the two census, was increased more than four-fold. This includes landed estate, public works, manufactures, and personal estate of every kind whatever. True, there is a dark side to this statement, which shows a huge national debt and great indebtedness on the part of most of the States, but the elasticity of the country bears loads of this kind with great equanimity, buoyed up with the confident assurance that its present and future resources will ensure certain liquidation.

Along with this increase of wealth, which is probably more generally distributed than in any other country on the globe, there is to be found a large increase of the comforts and luxuries of civilization, some of which penetrate the humblest cottages of the land. Foreign countries are made to contribute to the daily needs of the American citizen, and the oceans are whitened with sails bearing such contributions to our busy ports and then carrying off with them our own productions in exchange. Indeed, what would have been a rare luxury to the wealthy one century ago is now simply a necessity to the humble citizen. Its price brings it within the reach of his income, and his tastes lead him to require that which his income will secure. And this is not only true in regard to material wants, food, clothing and shelter, but also to those aesthetic wants which cultivated tastes create. Works of art are in demand, sculpture and painting are liberally encouraged, architecture is invited to unite the beautiful with the useful in public and private edifices, music finds votaries quite as enthusiastic as in the old world, and for all these branches of the fine arts money is expended with a very lavish hand. True, the taste which induces the expenditure is not always such as will stand fair criticism ; our galleries of paintings contain but little of the rare results of exalted talent as compared with the acres of canvass covered with mere daubs ; our statuary, notwithstanding some brilliant examples of native and foreign genius, contains hosts of figures like those exhibited in the horrible collection in the Capital for which the national treasury has been heavily mulcted ; our music is not always of the classic schools of Beethoven, Mozart or Handel, or even that conjured up by the weird genius of Richard Wagner, and our architecture only at rare intervals gives us a Girard College, while it mostly delights in the perpetration of costly enormities, embodying nothing but the idea of senseless expenditure. Still it is a gratifying circumstance that wealth has aspirations after that which is beautiful, and it bids us hope that in time, as cultivation advances, we shall rise from our present contentment with that which is mere pretense, to a higher, purer and more perfect art.

3. *Intellectual Progress.*—This may be shown in various ways, and notably by the number of institutions, public and private, devoted to educational purposes, from those where rudimentary instruction is given to those devoted to technical, professional and higher culture generally. The number of such institutions in 1870 was 141,629, with 221,042 teachers, and 7,209,938 pupils, at an expense of 95,402,726 dollars. These figures most eloquently set forth the appreciation of education in the land. They show how wide-spread must be the feeling that, without its aid, the people would be unfitted to solve the great problem of the national destiny. And this is still more satisfactorily shown by the great demand for intellectual pabulum, whether of a high or low degree. There were in the year mentioned 3,871 newspapers published in the United States, with a total of 1,508,548,250 copies annually issued, and an aggregate of 164,815 libraries, public and private, containing 45,528,938 volumes. The newspaper or the printed

volume is the source to which nearly every adult resorts for information, and these statistics show how large a number of readers there must be to justify such an enormous supply.

The intellectual progress of the nation is also shown, and in a way that gives her a high position, by the number of her authors who are acknowledged as of pre-eminent worth by the literary world. Prior to 1775 we find John Eliot published his Indian version of the Bible—now a rare curiosity to the biblomaniac—Cotton Mather his Magnalia Christi Americani, Jonathan Edwards his treatise on "The Freedom of the Will," Franklin his essays and scientific papers, which with a few books of scientific travels and historical contributions, are still referred to as of classic value. From 1775 to 1820 the political writings of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Hamilton, John Adams, Ames and Patrick Henry; the scientific productions of Rittenhouse, Rush, Barton, Wilson and others; the poetical effusions of Barlow, Trumbull and Hopkinson; the works of fiction of Brown, Brackenbridge,—represent strength of thought, careful research, and imaginative powers, although Sydney Smith at the close of this period asked the question "Who reads an American book?" as though there was no literature here worthy of notice. Then commenced a period in our literary history full of remarkable contributions in all the departments of intellectual labor, which have won a proud place in the libraries of the world. Bancroft, Schoolcraft, Prescott and Motley have taken their place among the historians; Irving, Cooper, Paulding, Poe and Hawthorne among the writers of fiction; Bryant, Longfellow, Halleck, Whittier, Lowell and Holmes among the poets; Audubon, Agassiz, Dana, Hare, Henry and Silliman among the scientists, and a host of others whose names would require hours to enumerate, have made contributions in every department of literature and science, which fully demonstrate the great talent of their authors and the high character of the literature of the nation. In the last half century America has left no niche in the temple of knowledge unstudied by her sons, and has made valuable contributions to them all.

4. *Scientific Progress.*—In science the nation has been no laggard. Since the time when Franklin *fulmen e cœlo, sceptrumque tyrannis eripuit*, it has always had citizens who have diligently

delved in this field. Franklin's researches into the mysteries of electricity but paved the way for those of Henry and Morse, whose discoveries culminated in the invention of the telegraph, and then the daring of an American pressed its application until the submarine cable was devised and successfully laid. And what an impulse to commerce, manufactures, and all the peaceful arts has not the telegraph given! There is something almost awe-inspiring in the thought that the slender wires that hang mid-air over land, through populous countries, over desert plains and barren mountains, as well as in the depths of old ocean, are the highways along which are constantly passing messages of business and love, announcements of birth or death, of triumph or defeat, of peace or war. It is a thousand times more wonderful than the stories of the Arabian Nights or the lying pretensions of mediaeval magicians.

Again, take the art of Heliography or sun-painting; although the first germ was not the discovery of an American, yet the honor of first taking the picture of a living man belongs to Draper of New York—a naturalized citizen. What has it not done towards the operpetuation of the loved and the beautiful! Have not discoveries rapidly followed each other in this art until its cultivators, with a bold venture, have even succeeded in catching the changing phases of a solar eclipse or a transit of Venus, and given them an enduring permanence never dreamed of in the wildest dreams of the craziest visionary? We have ceased to marvel at its triumphs, and only regret that mankind had not been blessed with its power centuries ago, so that we might now look upon the wonderful presentments of the countenances of those men of olden time, whose characters we have learned to love, reverence or adore.

And in the department of natural history our activity has been no less marked. Under the vigorous industry, earnest enthusiasm and wonderful genius of the naturalized Swiss Professor Agassiz—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—who relinquished European honors of the most attractive kind to labor and toil among the savans of our own land, not only has the Cambridge Museum, to which his energies were principally directed, risen to a magnitude and importance which makes it attractive to naturalists all over the world, but numerous others have sprung into existence, each bearing some important contribution to the knowledge of mankind. We have learned, money-making people as we are, to recognize science as worthy of our best brains and our severest labor.

To the question "Who reads an American book?" now will the reply come from every student's laboratory all over the world, "Without a knowledge of what the savans of the new world have done, one is but poorly acquainted with any field of investigation and study." They have gained a reputation among mankind which shames the silly nobility whose only claim to recognition is based upon what its ignorant forefathers with rude muscular force inflicted on their weaker brethren, and whose childish pride is content with a display of coats of arms emblazoned with tawdry decorations. They are enumerated among the benefactors of the race, whose glory consists in enlarging the field of investigation and increasing the knowledge of mankind.

5. *Progress in Mechanic Arts.*—The practical bent of the American mind finds every employment in the invention of improved forms of machinery, and the immense collection of models which fill the cases of the national Patent-Office furnishes abundant proof of great success. By improved machinery new occupations have been introduced and old ones have been caused to disappear. It would be impossible to mention even the most important of these, without taxing the patience of my audience beyond ordinary endurance. A glance at a few may serve to show how much American skill has done for the world in this department.

Formerly our grain was cut either with the sickle or cradle, and to gather in a moderate harvest, without large assistance from those engaged in the mechanical arts of our towns and villages, would have been almost impossible. Other occupations were thrown aside, and the harvest field was made to resound with the noise of busy crowds of men toiling and sweating over the heavy grain. Now by the aid of mechanical contrivances the work is done with comparatively little human assistance, and there is no hindrance to the business of the mechanic; while the farmer more speedily and surely gathers in the rich crops which nature returns for the labor he has expended upon the soil. The mower and reaper, moreover, enables larger crops to be cultivated and more food to be raised for home-population or exportation. It has diminished the necessity for human labor in one department, increased the material wealth of the country, and made it able to feed a larger number of citizens.

Again, the contrivances used for spinning, weaving and finishing cotton goods are mainly of American invention, resulting in increasing the quantity of the manufactured article yearly brought into market, diminishing its cost per yard, and giving employment to thousands of men, women and children who would otherwise be obliged to eke out a miserable existence, full of struggles with misery and starvation.

The printing press has been also made to receive the impress of American ingenuity. Instead of the slow movement of the old hand press, steam has been brought into requisition, and immense editions of our huge city daily newspapers are prepared in a few hours to meet the demand of a public greedy for the latest news—a demand which could not have been supplied at all by the hand-press of the older time.

The sewing machine, now an indispensable piece of furniture in every household, has lightened labor greatly, and diminished the drudgery to which the slave of the needle was doomed before its introduction. And not only has it made the plain sewing of the family an easy task, but it has opened a way for decorative work which develops the artistic taste and aesthetic faculties to an extent altogether impossible in former times. And it, with all its manifold improvements, is purely and absolutely the result of Amercan skill and American labor.

With one more illustration I shall close. Not many years ago the American would have readily admitted that he could never compete with the foreign mechanic in the construction of accurate time pieces, because it was believed that they must be made by hand to be of suitable delicacy, and the cost of labor in foreign countries was very much below that which was claimed to be its due in this country. Still, even here, American talent, combined with patience and perseverance, has gained a great triumph. It has devised machinery which finishes with the greatest possible accuracy all the intricate parts af the most delicate time-pieces, and its watches are now recognized as the best made in the world.

Such are some of the striking results attained by the United

States during the first hundred years of its existence,—attained while learning the lessons which its history so earnestly and impressively set before its citizens. It is proposed to signalize its Jubilee by making a public exhibition of the productions of its soil, the results of its ingenuity and mechanic talent, and of everything that will tend to show what nature has furnished and human skill has produced. In such an exhibition, North and South can honestly strike hands, not over a silly rhetorician's "bloody chasm" but with fraternal grasp and loyal zeal for the success of the nation in the future, as they gaze upon the wondrous results of her past success. And where should such an exhibition be held but on the spot where the first blast of liberty was blown, the reverberations of which have been echoing and re-echoing over hill and dale for these hundred years? And as young and old wend their way to the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia, to meet not only this grand display from our own country, but magnificent contributions from other nations and peoples that have been invited to bring all they may have of taste and skill, let their minds ponder the lessons learned in the past century, and dedicate themselves anew to the duty of preserving the liberties, which are offered to all by our Constitution, from peril, whether it come from foes within or foes without. Amid the rejoicing over the triumphs of American art and industry, let the memory recur to the old Independence bell, that first proclaimed "liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof," and then to the wonderful realization of its prophetic sound, through the blessing of a merciful Providence; until, full of a sense of profound obligation for the past and of absolute dependence in the future, the lips shall burst forth in the words of the Psalmist—

Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me bless His holy name.
Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits.

* * * * * *

Art. V.—THE COLONIAL LITERATURE OF PENNSYLVANIA.*

BY REV. PROF. J. H. DUBBS.

There is somewhere an ancient legend, which relates how an artist, who had attempted in vain to carve a statue out of a block of marble, almost in desperation quenched the brand that was burning on his hearth, and shaped it into the masterpiece that gave him fame and fortune. With somewhat similar feelings of discouragement, though without the slightest anticipation of similar success, we turn aside to-day from the grave and stately subjects which might be supposed to be best suited to an occasion like the present, to spend an hour in the contemplation of a theme so humble and homely, that it has, probably, hitherto received less attention than any other which we could possibly have selected. Let others carve the marbles of Pentelicus—we will be satisfied with a rough block hewn from our native forests.

Come then, abandon for the present your relations with Apollo and the Muses; let all the ancient classics sleep, while we contemplate the first beginnings of literature in our native state. The fountains of Helicon may be brighter and purer, but it is not for us to despise the tiny streamlets that refresh the wilderness.

Having chosen as our theme, The Colonial Literature of Pennsylvania, we deem it proper to premise that we use the word literature in its widest sense, as embracing the written productions of laborers in every department of human knowledge, and that we do not limit it to the class of writings which are distinguished for beauty of style and expression, and are more generally known as *belles lettres*.

The period to which we direct your attention is one which, though occupying a recent position in the history of the world, is yet, as far as this young country is concerned, already covered with the mists of hoary antiquity. It properly begins with the year 1638, when Peter Minuit—a German, and at one time a deacon in the Reformed church of the city of Wesel*—founded the first Swedish colony on the western bank of the Delaware; and extends to the Declaration of Independence, in 1776, whose glorious centennial we soon propose to celebrate.

---

*An address delivered at the annual opening of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Penna., Sept. 2, 1875.

It has been remarked that the literary history of a nation, or of a province, is sure to begin with a mythical period—an age of "Gorgons, and Hydras, and Chimeras dire"—in which fact and fiction are strangely blended. If such a period is to be accepted in the literary history of Pennsylvania, it must be supposed to end with the arrival of William Penn, in 1682. Though there are no traditions of Trojan wars and Argonautic expeditions; though we have no Nibelungen, to relate how Siegfried slew the dragon and won the beautiful Chriemhilda; yet it is true that, until very recently, our accounts of the early settlement of Pennsylvania were so vague and contradictory that they appeared to be almost mythical. It is but a year or two ago since we learned the particulars of Minuit's treaty with the Indians, which was, indeed, "the only treaty which was never broken." The Indians, by this treaty, ceded to the Swedish crown all the lands from Cape Henlopen to the falls of Trenton, and thence inland to the Susquehanna. This territory was carefully surveyed, and the boundary marked by a line of cedar posts, which were still seen in their places sixty years afterwards.† "It was in fact the Swedes," says Dr. Reynolds, "who inaugurated the peaceful policy of William Penn, for which he has been so deservedly praised, in his purchase of land from the Indians, and his uniformly friendly intercourse with them."‡ In short, every day serves to clear up more of the mystery that has hitherto obscured this portion of our history, and to give to the early Swedish settlers that credit which is their due. The recent translation and publication, by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, of Acrelius' "History of New Sweden," has but stimulated inquiry; and we are now promised translations of the Diary of

---

*See an article by Prof. Seidensticker, in "Der Deutsche Pionier," for January, 1875.

†Acrelius' "History of New Sweden," p. 23.

‡Ibid., p. 15.

Peter Lindstrom, the engineer who made the first map of New Sweden, and the Life of William Usselinx, who was the first to propose to Gustavus Adolphus the establishment of a Swedish colony on the banks of the Delaware; so that in all probability the period of the dominion of the Dutch and Swedes will soon be made as clear as any other portion of our national history.

Meagre and unsatisfactory as our knowledge of these early settlements may be, we have now to encounter statements of English origin, so strange, with particulars so fantastic, that "although most historians have felt bound to take notice of them, they have done so in a hopeless spirit, being unable to determine whether what was written was true, or whether it was not pure romance."*

In 1648 a little book was published in Middleburg, in Holland, of which a copy is preserved in the Philadelphia Library, which is thus entitled:

> "A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROVINCE OF NEW ALBION, *and a direction of adventurers with small stock to get two for one and good lands freely * * * together with a letter from Master Robert Evelyn, that lived there many years, showiug the particulars thereof.*"

This pamphlet purports to contain a description, by a certain Beauchamp Plantagenet, of "the glorious settlement of New Albion, the property of Sir Robert Ployden." "That part of America, or North Virginia," says the author,† "lying about 39 degrees on Delawere Bay, called *The Province of New Albion*, is situated in the best, and same temper as Italy, between too cold Germany and too hot Barbary; so this, lying just midway between New England, two hundred miles north, and Virginia, one hundred and fifty miles south, where are now settled eight thousand English and one hundred and forty ships in trade, is freed from the extreme cold and barrenness of the one, and heat and aguish marshes of the other; and is like Lombardy, a rich, fat soil, plain, having thirty-four rivers on the main land." The settlement is said to have been under the direction of the Albion Knights, for the conversion of the twenty-three heathen kings.

We find in this pamphlet glowing descriptions of no less than ten magnificent lordships and manors, in the possession of valiant knights and gentle dames, one of whom, a certain Lady Barbara, is called "the mirror of wit and beauty." One of these manors, Mount Ployden, is described as "the seat of the Raritan king, on the north side of the province, twenty miles from Sandhay sea, and ninety miles from the ocean, next to Amara Hill, the retired paradise of the Ethiopian king."

---

*Westcott's "History of Philadelphia," Chap. III.

† Proud's "History of Pennsylvania," p. 111.

There is a certain element of truth underlying all this high-sounding jargon; but how much of it is mere guess-work, it is probably now impossible to ascertain. It has, however, been discovered that Sir Robert Ployden received from Charles the First—who was always more ready to give away provinces than to pay his honest debts—a grant to a province in America, and that he attempted to found a settlement, which proved a failure in consequence of financial embarrassments. On this slender foundation it is probable that Beauchamp Plantaganet founded the story of New Albion, with all its gorgeous chivalry.

We turn from this mythical age, in which we too might be in danger of suffering our imagination to get the better of our judgment, to the second period of our literary history, which properly extends from the arrival of William Penn, in 1682, to the establishment of the first newspaper in Philadelphia, in the year 1719.

There is a very general impression that Pennsylvania was, in its earlier days, a kind of Bœotia, given over to hopeless ignorance, and heartily despising literature and art as proper works of the devil. The facts of the case will, however, we think, abundantly show that in no state of the Union were letters cultivated so early and so successfully. But a few months after the arrival of William Penn, Enoch Flower established a boarding school in Philadelphia, and within three years of that era, William Bradford, the first printer, had set up his press, and was almost constantly at work. It is curious to compare these facts with the almost contemporary utterances of the Governor of Virginia: "I thank God," said he, "we have not free schools nor printing; and I hope we shall not have these hundred years. For learning has brought disobedience, and heresy, and sects into the world; and printing has divulged them libels upon the government. God keep us from both!"*

---

*Chalmers, Vol. II., p 328.

The first book printed by Bradford was, of course, an almanac. It is entitled: "*Kalendarium Pennsylvaniense*, or America's Messenger, being an Almanac for the year of Grace 1686, by Samuel Atkyns, Student in the Mathematics and Astrology." This Samuel Atkyns—whoever he may have been—may therefore be regarded as the first Pennsylvanian author.

But Bradford soon had other work to do, besides the printing of almanacs. George Keith, the first preceptor in the Friends' Public School, became involved in a fierce controversy concerning the Society of Friends, which resulted in the organization of the "Christian Quakers," sometimes called "Fighting Friends," because they believed in the lawfulness of defensive warfare. The struggle was intense; no blood was shed, it is true, but the quantity of ink that flowed was positively dreadful. Pamphlets flew with fearful rapidity, and in the confusion which ensued, Bradford found it prudent to remove to New York, and Keith himself returned to England, where he became a clergyman in the established church. The "Keithians" generally followed the example of their leader, and were mainly instrumental in the foundation of the first Episcopal churches in the city of Philadelphia.

After the storm there was a season of quiet, during which men began to direct their attention to polite literature. At this time Gabriel Thomas wrote his quaint "History of Pennsylvania and West New Jersey," in which he informs the world that "children born in Pennsylvania are not only well-favored and beautiful, but are in general observed to be better-natured, milder, and more tender-hearted than those born in England." If this statement is incorrect, it is certainly not because our author had not abundant opportunities for observation. "I was," he says, "an eye witness to all contained in this book, for I went in the first ship that was bound from England for that country, since it received the name of Pennsylvania. I saw the first cellar, when it was digging, for the use of our Governor, William Penn."

Of the state of literature in the province he says: "In the said city (Philadelphia) are several good schools of learning for youth in order to the attainment of the arts and sciences, as also reading, writing, etc." And then in the same paragraph, and in the same breath, he continues: "Here *is* to be had, on any day of the week, tarts, pies, cakes, etc. Happy blessings (*i. e.* the learning and the pies), for which we owe the highest gratitude to our plentiful Provider, the great Creator of Heaven and earth."*

Our author appears to regard professional men with but little favor, for he continues:

"Of lawyers and physicians I shall say nothing, because the country is very peaceable and healthy. Long may it continue so, and never have occasion for the tongue of the one nor the pen of the other, both equally destructive to men's estates and lives; because forsooth, they have a license to murder and to make mischief."

These extracts from the writings of the staid historian of this primitive era may serve to prepare us for the productions of the poetic muse. Unfortunately, they create the impression of having been made with an imported machine, which the colonists had not yet had time to get into proper running order. Rhythm was not of the slightest consequence, and their rhymes did not even jingle. Still, it may be well, on account of their antiquarian interest, to give our readers a few extracts from these ancient poetical compositions.

In 1692, Richard Frame, of whose personal history we know nothing, published in "what he called verse," "A Short Description of Pennsylvania," containing the following reference to the settlement at Germantown, quoted by Whittier in the Introduction to his "Pennsylvania Pilgrim:"

"The German town of which I spoke before,
Which is at least in length one mile or more,
Where lives High German people and Low Dutch,
Whose trade in weaving linen cloth is much,—
There grows the flax, as also you may know
That from the same they do divide the tow.
Their trade suits well their habitation,—
We find convenience for their occupation."

Four years later, in 1696, Thomas Holme, one of the Judges of the County Court of Philadelphia, composed a "True Relation of the Flourishing State of Pennsylvania," of which the following extract, in which he describes the trees growing in the province, is a favorable specimen:

---

*Memoirs of Hist. Soc. of Penna. vol. I., p. 121.

"Cedar, beech, maple and black walnut fine;
The ash, oak, hickory, and sweet-scented pine;
With such abundance more, both great and small,
That scarcely any man can name them all.
Mulberries, hazel-nuts, strawberries and plumbs,
Which pleaseth those well who to eat them comes;
Brave huckleberries, which are very dainty,
We have them each year in exceeding plenty;
Cranberry sauce and tarts do we make when
We greet our friends, ladies or gentlemen;
Grapes, walnuts, chesnuts, many things beside,
Which God by nature doth for us provide.

"Here's men do plant great orchards here,
Which brings great store of fruit to them each year;
Great stores of cherries and divers sorts;
Planters bring them to town in boats;
We may admire how all of them are spent,
I never saw so many but in Kent;
Some make of them a very pleasant drink,
Which they call cherry wine, I do think;
Good peaches we have in such plenty great,
The half of them the people cannot eat;
Here's apple, pears and quinces in such store,
And in a few years we may have many more;
And fruit trees do grow so fast in this ground
That we begin with cider to abound."

Our author deems Bradford, the printer, worthy of especial notice:

"Here dwells a printer, and I find
That he can print both books and bind;
He wants not paper, ink, nor skill;
He's owner of a paper mill.
The paper mill is here hard by,
And makes good paper frequently."

Holme expatiates also on the linen and woolen manufacture "camblet, serge and drugget;" and of an intention to build a saw mill near the Schuylkill:

"The saw-mill at Chester before
Was not enough; we've wanted more,
That all the benefit may reap
Of buying boards and plank good cheap."

He also has something to say about schools:

"Here we have schools of divers sorts,
To which our youth daily resorts.
Good women, who do very well,
Bring little ones to read and spell,
Which fits them for writing; and then
Here's men to bring them to their pen,
And to instruct and make them quick
In all sorts of arithmetick."*

From a literary point of view all this is, of course, nothing but miserable trash; but there is about it a certain *naivete* that renders it endurable. Let it not be forgotten that these books constitute the *incunabula* of our literature, and that we consequently read them with a degree of interest and sympathy which we would refuse to grant to similar productions of a more recent date. When we find Thomas Makin, in his "Encomium Pennsylvaniæ," boldly "breaking Priscian's head," we do not feel inclined to be critical, but are rather pleased to find a Pennsylvanian at so early a date attempting, however imperfectly, to compose verses in the language of the Mantuan bard. It does not hurt our feelings to read, in Dickinson's "God's Protecting Providence"(1699), how the author's hero, Robert Barrow, after having been wonderfully delivered from a long captivity among the Indians, is said to have died "rejoicing in the downfall of George Keith, and testifying stoutly against the stipendiary clergy and the militia." Time, that old "*edax rerum,*" has wonderfully smoothed down these asperities, so that what would have enraged our ancestors can only provoke a smile from their descendants.

The literary history of this primitive period would be incomplete without some reference to the pioneers of that great German immigration to which our State is indebted for the chief elements of its present prosperity. Most of these were, indeed, strangely erratic in their religious notions, but they were, at any rate, men of high classical and literary culture. First came Pastorius, the German Quaker, whom Whittier has recently immortalized in his "Pennsylvania Pilgrim." In the fatherland he had been an author of no mean repute, and even in America we are told he wrote,

---

*Westcott's "History of Philadelphia," Ch. xli.

"—in half the languages of man
His 'Rusca Apium,' which with bees began,
And through the gamut of creation ran."

It is creditable to our German immigration that such a man as Pastorius should have been its pioneer. While we could wish that it had been the privilege of a Pennsylvanian to do justice to his memory, we cannot fail to be grateful to the poet who has given him a tribute more enduring than sculptured marble or monumental brass.

After Pastorius there arrived a confused multitude of Mennonites and Labadists, and mystics of every shade; but among all these various sects there is none more curious and interesting than the Society of the Women in the Wilderness, which, about 1694, under the leadership of John Kelpius, erected the monastery on the Wissahickon, near Philadelphia, around which a modern writer,* in a once-popular novel, attempted to throw the glamour of poetry and romance. There, says Whittier,

"Painful Kelpius, in his hermit den
By Wissahickon, maddest of good men,
Dream'd o'er the Chiliast dreams of Petersen,
Reading the books of Daniel and of John;
And Behmen's Morning Redness through the Stone
Of Wisdom vouchsafed to his eyes alone!
Whereby he read what man ne'er read before,
And saw the visions man shall see no more,
Till the great angel, striding sea and shore,
Shall bid all flesh await, on land and ships,
The warning trump of the Apocalypse,
Shattering the heavens before the dread eclipse."

The stone of wisdom, through which Kelpius beheld his visions, would even now be a most desirable possession; but unfortunately—so runs the legend—when the seer felt the approach of death, he feared that his treasure might fall into unworthy hands, and therefore bore it to the banks of the Schuylkill, where, after gazing upon it long and fondly, he cast it into the depths, whence it has never been recovered. As to what occurred when the precious talisman fell into the waters, we would be left entirely in the dark, were it not that we have an illustrious precedent in King Arthur, who, when he came to die, compelled Sir Bevidere to take his magic sword Excalibur, "and fling him far into the middle meer:"

---

*George Lippard.

> "And then, behold! an arm,
> Clothed in white samite, mystic, wonderful,
> That caught him by the hilt and brandished him
> Three times, and drew him under the meer."*

Of course the scene was re-enacted when Kelpius threw the stone of wisdom into the river—and then there came a dusky barge that held three weeping queens with crowns of gold, who bore him with them to the isle of Avalon.

We come now to the third or historical period of the literary history of our Commonwealth. It begins with December 22, 1719, when Andrew Bradford issued the first number of the *American Weekly Messenger*—a poor, miserable sheet, it is true, but, like the first swallow of spring-time, it was the harbinger of a brighter era. Several years later, Samuel Keimer began the publication of a second paper, which was modestly entitled *The Universal Instructor in all the Arts and Sciences and Pennsylvania Gazette.* Keimer appears to have been confident of his ability to instruct all mankind, and it was his constant trouble that an ignorant world refused to receive his gratuitous instructions.

He was something of a poet, too, for when Benjamin Franklin, in 1723, applied to him for work as a journeyman printer, he found him composing an elegy to the memory of another poet, Aquila Rose—literally *composing* it—for he had his composing-stick in his hand, and was setting up his verses in type without ever committing them to paper. Such poetical facility is rare, and its rarity is a blessing to the world. Poets like Rose and Keimer remind us of the couplet:

> Swans sing before they die; 'twere no bad thing
> Did certain poets die before they sing.

At this period the Governors of the colony were, almost without exception, men of distinguished literary ability. Thomas Lloyd, the first Deputy Governor, had graduated at Oxford with distinguished honors, and was one of the best classical scholars of his age. The most eminent of them all was, however, James Logan, a statesman and a scholar, who was for many years the Mæcenas of our struggling authors. Equally distinguished as the author of Latin treatises on obscure scientific subjects, and as an accomplished translator of the works of classical antiquity, his fame is preserved by the great Loganian library, of which he was the founder.

---

*Tennyson's "Morte d'Arthur."

But there is one man, of all others, in whom the literary history of the Colonial period appears to centre. Take him all in all, the world has seen few greater men than the Philadelphia printer, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

Apart from his services to his country and the world as a statesman and as a scientific philosopher, his influence on our literature, though unobtrusive, was practically unlimited. "Poor Richard" was beloved in every household, and his quaint utterances became the prototype of the homely humor and wisdom which are to the present day affected by our most popular authors. During his whole public life he labored incessantly for the good of the community, and almost all our more ancient literary and benevolent institutions owe their existence, in part, at least, to his energy and public spirit. Among these me may mention the Philadelphia Library, the Pennsylvania Hospital, the American Philosophical Society, the University of Pennsylvania, and last, but we hope not least, Franklin and Marshall College.*

Franklin was but twenty-one years of age when he established the "Junto," a literary club, which was maintained for upward of forty years. At its meetings, which were held every Friday evening at the old Indian King Tavern, he gathered around him all the brightest minds in the Province, and, though few in numbers, they constituted a literary circle which has never been excelled in the history of our country. Among these were Thomas Godfrey, the inventor of the quadrant, and his gifted son, the author of the "Prince of Parthia," the first drama ever written in America; the Bartrams, father and son, of the elder of whom Linnæus said that he was "the greatest natural botanist in the world;"

---

* Franklin College, one of the institutions now consolidated into Franklin and Marshall College, was founded at Lancaster, Pa., in 1787. It was named after Benjamin Franklin, who contributed largely to its funds, and who personally laid the corner-stone of the first college building. On the latter occasion he was accompanied by Hector St. John Crevecœur, the author, who in his works has left a record of the event.

Beveridge, the Latinist, and Ralph, the poet and historian, "whom," as some one has said, "the great Alexander Pope himself *honored* with an insulting couplet." There, too, at a later period, was probably Daniel Rittenhouse, who still ranks as our greatest American astronomer, with men like Benjamin Rush, Francis Hopkinson, John Dickinson and Hugh Williamson, who were equally distinguished as citizens of their native country and of the republic of letters. Perhaps, too, the historian Robert Proud, who was, like his "History of Pennsylvania," "a most stately, old-fashioned article," may have occasionally honored the "Junto" with his presence; but it can hardly be supposed that the old Tory should have been intimate with men whom he must have regarded as incipient rebels.

It was, however, not only in the circle which gathered around the person of Benjamin Franklin that letters were cultivated: the whole Province was full of literary activity. The Swedish pastors wrote extensive accounts of their mission, which were published in their native country. The Germans, too, were no less active than their English brethren. Christopher Lower, of Germantown, was at the head of the largest publishing house in America, and not only printed several editions of his large German Bible before any American printer undertook its publication in English, but issued several hundred German volumes, many of which enjoyed an enormous circulation. The Protestant monks of Ephrata, with incredible labor, composed and published their quaint volumes, bearing, according to the fashion of the times, such titles as "Apples of Gold in Pictures of Silver" and "The Song of the Solitary and Forsaken Turtle Dove." The Lutherans composed the "Halle'sche Nachrichten;" Schlatter wrote a Journal of his Travels; the Moravians issued volume after volume, principally concerning their wonderful work among the North American Indians.

In brief, wherever we look, we behold signs of literary activity which were truly wonderful, considering the depressing circumstances by which the colonists were surrounded. Many of the books published were, of course, prompted by theological controversies which have long been forgotten; they were

Dull, doubtless, but with here and there a flash.

With the approach of the Revolution, however, *political* writings became more numerous, and in the satires and broadsides of that period there is not only plenty of wit and humor, but we find many evidences of a high degree of literary culture.

Upon the Revelutionary period we do not on this occasion propose to enter. We have said enough, we think, to show that as Pennsylvanians we have no cause to be ashamed of the literary labors of our forefathers. On the contrary, their faithful, though humble, efforts in the cause of religion, literature, and science, demand at our hands the fullest recognition and the most sacred veneration. Their energy and perseverance in the face of the most appalling difficulties, not to speak of their unquestionable literary ability, cannot fail to command our constant wonder and admiration.

We owe it to ourselves, no less than to our ancestors, to give them the honor which is their due; for any people which affects to despise the past, is taking the most certain course to insure its own destruction. Like a branch abruptly cut off from the tree on which it grew, it must speedily wither. To the superficial observer it may appear as though the Colonial period of our literary history were a mere chaos; but closer observation must behold in all these apparently conflicting elements the working of the life process which has produced the present, and which must, in one form or another, continue working until the end of time. As in geology it has come to be felt that the old cataclysmal theory is no longer tenable, so in history we cannot admit the existence of a chasm that can sever the present from the past. To do so would be to deprive history of all its meaning, and to throw disrespect upon the plan and purpose of Almighty God.

The success which attended the literary labors of our ancestors during the Colonial period should also incite their descendants to generous emulation. It is to be feared that our good old Commonwealth has failed to maintain the relative literary position, in comparison with other portions of our country, which it undoubtedly held during the period immediately antecedent to the American Revolution. This acknowledgment may be humiliating; but the fact being known, the noblest motives of patriotism should nerve the educated young men of Pennsylvania to nobler struggles and more brilliant triumphs.

There is, however, a higher motive to literary labor, which appeals especially to the present generation; a motive which does not spring from any local allegiance, but is as wide as humanity itself. We are living in a skeptical age, in which we are constantly confronted by the most refined and insidious forms of unbelief; when almost everything that we read is saturated by the subtle poison of infidelity; and the fact lays an obligation on every Christian scholar, not only to become acquainted with the contents of his faith, but to defend it against its enemies. To meet these new adversaries we must present the truth in new aspects, for it is idle to affirm that ancient methods must be sufficient to meet every emergency. Just as well might we advise our government to arm our soldiers with the match-locks and flint guns used by our ancestors, while surrounding nations are in possession of needle-guns and chassepot rifles. There was a time when England boasted that she had obtained the mastery of the world by means of her fleets, which she affectionately termed her "wooden walls," but what could the whole fleet, with which Nelson won at the battle of the Nile, accomplish in opposition to a single iron-clad steamer? Just so it is in matters of religion, as well as in polite literature and science. The arguments and modes of expression which suit one age may not answer for another, and it therefore becomes us to consider carefully the nature of the weapons which we draw forth from the armory of truth.

The present age stands greatly in need of a genuine Christian literature, and let those to whom God has granted the requisite talent labor without ceasing to produce it; not in the pursuit of vain ambition, but in the hope of bringing a worthy tribute to the cause of our blessed Saviour.

It is a grand thing in these days to be a student, and we plead with you to magnify your office. Our country is more in need of faithful students than of heroic warriors. The Church of the living God—attacked by the powers of darkness on the right hand and on the left—claims your faithful service. The cross needs soldiers who understand its mystery—who, having come to comprehend the contents of their faith, are able to maintain and to defend them.

In short, from every walk of life, from the highest to the humblest, there comes a special call for faithful students. *Ora et labora.* "The night cometh when no man can work."

We are living in dark and troublous times, and sometimes we think we recognize in them some of the signs that are to precede the second coming of the Son of Man. But, what if we be really approaching the eventide of the world's history? Commend us to the spirit of the stern old Puritan legislator, who, on the celebrated "dark day," when alarmed by the unusual darkness it was proposed to adjourn the legislature, rose and exclaimed: "Either this is God's day of judgment or it is not. If it is not, it is useless to adjourn. If it is the day of judgment, I prefer that my Judge should find me doing my duty. Bring in the candles!" and they brought them in.

The true student of history does not suffer his mind to dwell on dead antiquity to the exclusion of the present and the future. His reverence for the past is not mere antiquarianism; it involves an earnest determination to press onward with the stream of history. While, therefore we plead with you to reverence the past, we urge you to press forward manfully and to prepare yourselves to take a worthy part in the contests of the future.

As we journey onward together, let us remember that to labor solely for the applause of men is foolish, if not criminal. In another hundred years the names of the most distinguished of the present generation will be as thoroughly forgotten as are those of the pioneers of our Colonial literature. Yet it is cheering to remember that the aloe may bloom a century after the hand that planted it has returned to dust and ashes; that not a single seed of truth will ever be lost, though it may require ages to develop the full glory of its flower and fruit.

"Even so
The world forgets, but the wise angels know."

ART. VI.—PAUL AT ATHENS.

BY REV. P. S. DAVIS, D. D.

FIFTEEN hundred and fifty-six years before the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, and seven hundred and eighty years before the common era of Olympiads, Cecrops brought a little band from Egypt, and landed on a rugged promotory in the Egean sea. There already, it is thought by some, he instituted the Areopagus—a court, from which laws were given to a nation, and which was destined to excise a controlling influence on the civilized world. The time is so far back that it is almost lost in the twilight of fable. The belief of the people in those early ages was, that their very divinities vied with each other in their efforts to become the tutelar deity of the colony. Neptune, in his chariot—a beautifully tinted sea-shell, drawn by dolphins—rose up from the foam and proffered his trident. But Minerva, the patroness of wisdom, war, and all the liberal arts, quickly alighted upon the highest point of the sea-girt rocks, and snatching the honor from the god of the ocean, gave her name to the place. These men afterwards built her one of the most magnificent temples the world ever saw; and sixteen centuries from the time that Cecropia became Athena, that temple, surmounted with her image adorned with shield and helmet, glittered in the sun and dazzled the weak eyes of St. Paul, as he sailed into the Piraeus to preach the gospel in the city.

The city itself was indeed a wonder. It seemed to rise out of the waves like a crown of gold set with many a gem, and flashed in the light for miles over the blue waters of the Egean. Nor did it prove to be a mere gilded cloud when more nearly approached. Its foundations were laid down upon a rock, and its twenty-two miles of walls were so massive that an assailing enemy once stopped in the midst of an assault to admire the strength and beauty of the masonry. But rising in marble whiteness far above the walls, were the Acropolis, the Parthenon, and fanes to nearly all the divinities of the heathen world. There were academies, and theatres, and palaces with pillared porticos. Every building was a model of architecural beauty, and all the city was adorned with olive groves and fountains and statues of gods and heroes. Powerful armaments guarded her shores, and argosies brought the wealth of far-off countries to her ports. The civilization of the world centred there, so that Athens was a tiaraed queen holding a golden sceptre, and the richest jewel in her crown was wisdom. Greece was the land of intellectual culture, and Athens was "the eye of Greece."

And the glory of Athens was not simply that she had numbered men of genius among her citizens. It was not simply that Themistocles had destroyed the fleets of Xerxes and driven back the hosts of Persia. It was not simply that Pericles had been her wise ruler. It was not simply that Phidias had made an image of Minerva out of ivory and gold that was said to be absolutely faultless, or that Demosthenes had pronounced orations no word of which could be altered except for the worse. It was not simply that individual poets had struck the lyre and brought forth sounds that still float like fairy music around the sunny isle. The effect of all this upon the masses was very great. The world had never seen a city whose common people were so cultivated in many respects. Works of the highest excellency in art were to be seen wherever they looked—in the temples and groves, and in every niche and corner of the streets; and these so elevated their tastes, that they turned away from deformity with pain, and want of symmetry in any object was grating to their sensibilities. Every artisan, to be accepted, must be an artist; and the common vessels used in the culinary departments of their homes have furnished the models for our finest ornamental vases. Sages and statesmen, orators and poets, taught the people in the public places. Everything was open to competition; and a popular historian has declared that no modern university has so excellent a system of education, by which he seems to mean one so calculated to reach, and fire, and train the minds of the populace. "Let us for a moment," he says "transport ourselves in thought to that glorious city. Let us imagine that we are entering its gates, in the time of its honor and glory. A crowd is assembled around a portico. All are gazing with delight at the entablature, for Phidias is putting up a frieze. We turn into another street—a rhapsodist is reciting there; men, women, children are thronging round him; the tears are running down their cheeks; their eyes are fixed; then every breath is still, for he is telling how Priam fell at the feet of Achilles, and kissed those hands—the terrible, the murderous—which had slain so many of his sons. We enter the public place—there is a ring of youths, all leaning forward, with sparkling eyes, and gestures of expectation; Socrates is pitted against a famous Atheist from Ionia, and has just brought him to a contradiction in terms. But we are interrupted. The heralds are crying—'Room for the Prytanes.' The general assembly is to meet. The people are swarming in on every side. Proclamation is made—'Who wishes to speak?' There is a shout and a clapping of hands. Pericles. is mounting the stand. Then for a play of Sophocles; and away to sup with Aspasia."*

The brilliant essayist was right in his estimate of all this. Its tendency was to stimulate and cultivate thought and speech. The rude native sailors halloed to their fellows from galley to galley in classic Greek. They rushed up between the long walls and crowded the theatres at night to listen to the comedies of Menander, and they hissed at the mispronunciation of a single syllable. Language, we are told, was so unusually elegant and refined among the people that a simple old huckster woman, who sold herbs in the market, distinguished Theophrastus as a foreigner by the affectation of a single word.

To this illustrous city the great Apostle of the Gentiles had come, fleeing from Barea, but with his heart full of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Much of the glory of the place then lived only in history and in song. There were many traces of decay. The long walls were dilapidated, and indeed the Piraeus or port was no longer regarded as a part of the city. The men of genius had fallen asleep. But though the eagles had taken flight, the eyrie remained. The eye of the stranger still rested with wonder upon temples and porticoes, and upon statues and masterpieces of art.

---

*Athenian Orators, by Macaulay.

The bazars, all neat and clean as a public square in a modern city, were filled with people. The olive and plane trees, and thickets of "torrent-loving shrubs of Greece," in which nightingales sung from dusk until midnight, still rendered their grateful shades, and helped to make the whole city look like a well kept villa in a summer garden. We may quote an interesting author on this subject. "Let us walk with the Apostle," he says, "from Phalerus to the city. As he steps on shore at the port, he sees before him the splendid temple of Ceres, another to Minerva, and another to Jupiter. A little farther on are some altars, and pausing to read the inscription, he finds on one of them the dedication, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD; perhaps Jehovah, the great god of the Jews, or rather of all people and of the universe. What is yonder temple with neither door nor roof? It is Juno's, burnt by Mardonius, at the time of the Persian invasion. He enters the city gates and on either hand are painted porticoes, with bronze statues of the most illustrious characters which the city has produced. On the left is the Pnyx, with its bema cut from the solid rock—the bema which still rivets the traveler's gaze—the very spot whence the orator poured forth his thunder against the prince of Macedon. Advancing onward, he beholds the statues of Conon, and his little less celebrated son Timotheus; and then another painted portico, on whose walls is portrayed the battle of Montinœa, and in the foreground of it may be seen the commanding figure of Epaminondas. His eye now rests on a statue whose kindling features and vehement action bespeak a whirlwind of thought within—it is Demosthenes; he whose phillippics Paul had studied (and not in vain) at Jerusalem. Here are statues of Harmodius and Aristogeton, of Miltiades and Themistocles. There is Philip of Macedon, and near him is the more mighty conqueror still, Alexander the Great. Beyond is the majestic figure of Solon, the Athenian legislator, erected in front of a portico, where in glowing colors are represented the capture of Troy, and the glorious struggle of the band of patriots against the hosts of Persia on the field of Marathon. Paul would scarcely enter the idolatrous temples by which he was surrounded; or in one, that of Demus and the Graces, he might have seen a statue in bronze on which an Israelite would have gazed with interest—that of Hyrcanus, the Jewish High Priest.

On the left he passes the Areopagus, or Mars' hill, ascended by sixteen steps from the forum or market place on the southeast, and on the platform at the top (a circuit of some fifty yards) is the court of the Areopagus, the Senate of Athens, the august assembly that determined the weightiest matters of policy and settled the religion of the State. At their bar was Socrates arraigned, and there Paul was soon himself to plead. In front of him rises aloft the eternal citadel, the Acropolis crowned with the marvel of every age, from Pericles to the present, the Parthenon. "The Lord of heaven and earth dwelleth not in temples made with hands," or He had dwelt in this. By the side of it on the height stands the champion of the city, Minerva Promachus, wrought in bronze with helmed head and spear in hand; a colossal statue, visible from a vast distance to the wayfarer by land and the mariner by sea. To describe all the temples and statues at Athens would be an endless task. There was every conceivable variety of structure and sculpture. There were statues colossal, full size and diminutive; some in bronze, others in marble; others in stone, others in wood; others in pottery, some plain, others painted; others overlaid with ivory, or gold, or silver; some isolated, others projecting in relief from the wall."*

We have every evidence that St. Paul was well acquainted with the history and literature of Greece, but we may well imagine from this description, how the effort to perpetuate the fame of heroes and scholars, as this expressed itself in Athens, must have struck the mind of one whose early life had been spent in Jerusalem, in whose circuit no image was to be seen! But it was not simply the statues of warriors, statesmen and poets, that made such a deep impression upon his mind. The vain-glory of earth was doubtless sad enough to him, but the objects of Athenian *worship* which he saw overpowered him with a sense of their falsity, and inspired him with a desire to declare to them the only true God, who after all was an unknown being to them; for in his most direct walk from the Peiraic gate, past the Agora to the Acropolis, he saw not only images of all the gods on Olympus, but that catalogue exhausted, he beheld representations of impersonal virtues and vices—the thoughts and ideals of genius expressed in marble, or made to speak from the living canvas.

---

*Lewin's Life and Epistles of Paul. Vol. I., pp. 270–273.

No wonder that the Apostle felt an oppresssive loneliness in the midst of the strange scenes by which he was surrounded, and that his heart was stirred within him when he saw the people wholly given to idolatry. Long before this Cicero had come there with the reverence of a pilgrim, and years after the time of the Apostle Pausanias traversed these memorable places and scrutinized everything in the spirit of a superstitious antiquarian. But now Paul's chief desire was to urge men to forsake their vanities and seek the living God. He first preached to the Jews whom he found there; with what success we do not know. He was probably reviled by them as usual, although he met some devout persons;* but at any rate the chief mission of his life was with the Gentiles. Soon "certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics encountered him," and this gave him an opportunity to fulfill his mission. "Some said, What will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection. And they took him and brought him to the Areopagus, saying, "May we know what this new doctrine whereof thou speakest is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know therefore what these things mean."†

Although the Apostle was not taken to the Areopagus for the trial of any charges brought against him, but simply to hear what new thing he had to say, yet we are reminded that he was taken to the place "where the most awful court of judicature had sat from time immemorial, to pass sentence on the greatest criminals, and to decide the most solemn questions connected with religion."

Howson, the well known biographer of the Apostle, whom we may quote at the risk of some repetition, thus speaks of it: "The judges sat in the open air upon seats hewn out of the rock, on a platform which was ascended by a flight of stone steps, immediately from the Agora. On this spot a long series of awful causes connected with crime and religion had been determined, beginning with the legendary trial of Mars, which gave to the place its name of Mars'

---

*Acts xvi: 17. †Acts xvii: 18-20.

Hill." A temple of the god was on the brow of the eminence; and an additional solemnity was given to the place by the sanctuary of the Furies, in the broken cleft of the rock immediately below the judges' seat. Even in the political decay of Athens, this spot and this court were regarded by the people with superstitious reverence. It was a scene with which the dread recollections of centuries were associated. It was a place of silent awe in the midst of a gay and frivolous city. Those who withdrew to the Areopagus from the Agora, came as it were into the presence of a higher power. No place in Athens was so suitable for a discourse upon the mysteries of religion."*

It is evident that those who sat in the Areopagus felt themselves authorized to pronounce judicially upon the religion of St. Paul, although those who brought him to the tribunal scarcely supposed that what he said would be worthy of great consideration. They in all probability thought that the novelty of his theory might amuse them for an hour, "for all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing."†

And yet there is no point in the annals of the first planting of Christianity which seizes so powerfully upon the imagination, as that at which the Apostle is brought into contact with the worldly wisdom and honor that here found its highest expression. He was confronted by the world life that had gone out in its utmost grasp after the divine, and he was bound to challenge all that was false by the presentation of Him who was the Truth. It is this that invests the Apostle at this time with such wonderful interest. "Paul in Athens! Once the bigoted Jew, now the champion of Christianity, amongst the vaunted sages and philosophers of the great metropolis of letters. How curiosity is on stretch to know his reception! They who were stirred by the trumpet blast of Demosthenes, will they listen to one no less eloquent, and of deeper feeling, and advocating a cause of far higher and of everlasting import? They who followed with delight the speculative flights of Plato, in his vain searchings after truth, can they fail to be ravished by the full light poured upon their darkened vision, direct revelation from the Deity? Oh! that Paul could have met Socrates in the market place, and that Plato had written the dialogue! But Socrates and Plato had long passed away."* It made no difference. The revelation of God was not to stand in the wisdom of men, and what Paul said has been recorded for us by St. Luke, with the Holy Spirit for his guide.

---

*Life and Epistles of St. Paul. Vol. 1, pp. 374-375.

†Acts xvii. 21.

It has often been regretted that the English translation of the Apostle's speech makes it seem abrupt, and calculated to irritate its auditors, when in fact it is marked by graceful courtesy and consummate skill. Neander has some remarks upon this subject which are very forcible. "The discourse of Paul on this occasion is an admirable specimen of his apostolic wisdom and eloquence: we may here perceive how the Apostle (to use his own language) to the heathens, became a heathen that he might gain the heathens to Christianity. Inspired by feelings that were implanted from his youth in the mind of a pious Jew, and glowing in zeal for the honor of his God, Paul must have been horribly struck at the spectacle of idolatry that met him wherever he turned his eyes. He might easily have been betrayed by his feelings into intemperate language. And it evinced no ordinary self-denial and self-command, that instead of beginning with expressions of detestation, instead of representing the whole religious system of the Greeks as a Satanic delusion, he appealed to the truth which lay at its basis, while he sought to awaken in his hearers the consciousness of God which was oppressed by the power of sin, and thus aimed at leading them to that Saviour whom he came to announce. As among the Jews, in whom the knowledge of God formed by divine revelation led to a clear and pure development of the idea of the Messiah, he could appeal to the national history, the law and the prophets, as witnesses of Christ; so here he appealed to the undeniable anxiety of natural religion after the unknown God. He began with acknowledging in the religious zeal of the Athenians, a true religious feeling, though erroneously directed; an undeniable tending of the mind toward something divine. He begins with acknowledging in a laudatory manner the strength of the religious sentiment among the Athenians, and adducing as proof of it, that whilst walking amongst the sacred edifices, he lighted on an altar dedicated to the unknown God."[*]

---

*Lewin.

The great historian will be proven to be right, if we compare our English translation with the true rendering of the original. In our common version it reads thus: "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious; for as I passed by and saw your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription: *To the Unknown God.* Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you" (Acts xvii. 22–23). This has been more properly rendered "Ye men of Athens, all things which I behold bear witness to your carefulness[†] in religion. For as I passed through your city, and beheld the objects of your worship,[‡] I found among them an altar with this inscription: *To the Unknown God.* Whom therefore ye worship, though you know Him not, Him declare I unto you."

Any one who compares these two renderings can see the difference. He will see that the Apostle tells them that their altar to an unknown God proves both their desire to worship and their ignorance of the proper object of worship. He refers gracefully to their city, and to their pride of origin; but shows that all men are made of one blood, and that the place and time appointed for each nation's existence is only a part of one great scheme of a common Father. He quotes their own poets to prove this, and argues that if all men are the offspring of God, we ought not to think Him like unto graven images of gold, or silver, or stone. He reminds them of their fruitless gropings toward God; that in times past God had overlooked this ignorance, but now had revealed Himself and called upon men to repent and prepare for the judgment of Christ, whose resurrection was the proof of His divinity.

As long as the Apostle confined himself to the doctrines of theism the representatives of both schools of philosophy seemed to listen to him with attention; but when he spoke of the resurrection, some ridiculed him, and others expressed a desire to hear him again—perhaps through earnest desire for further enlightenment on the subject, but just as likely as not, to intimate politely that further discourse was not agreeable to them at that time. Very few of them became believers.

---

[*] Planting and training of the Church, Book III, Chap. vi., p. 115.

[†] *δεισιδαιμονεστερους.* They were careful or solicitous to enrol as their own every God that was adored on the face of the earth, although it was death for any private person to disturb the religion of the state by introducing any deity not recognized by the proper authorities. Their anxiety not to exclude one through whom they had received a favor, although unknown, seemed to have induced them to build the altar of which Paul is speaking. See below.

[‡] *σεβάσματα.* Evidently not devotions.

The idea of the resurrection transcended all of their philosophy. They had dreamed of a future life for the soul, but there was a limit to the power of their deities even in that direction. Orpheus, who could move the stones with the sweetness of his music, could not bring Eurydice from the regions of Pluto. And now, when they were told of a reversal of the law of death, in such a way that even the bodies of men were to be re-invested with a new and undying life, they held the whole idea in derision and scorn. Their reasonings had not taught it to them, and to the Christian faith they now chose to be strangers. The whole conception of salvation through One who Himself had died as a malefactor, that entering the gates of Hades he might come back a victor, was to the Greeks foolishness.

They never heard the Apostle again. After these things Paul departed from Athens. Directed by the Spirit of God, he left the city wedded to its worldly wisdom, and there is no evidence that he ever returned to it. Certain it is that we read in the New Testament of the establishment of no church in that far-famed place. We have letters of the Apostle to the churches in Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Philippi, Collosse, and Thessalonica, but "we have no epistle of Paul to the Athenians"—an omission under the circumstances speaks volumes, and tells us what momentous issues were involved when the ambassador of God departed from Athens.

The whole struggle of heathenism, as this culminated in Greece, was an effort to reunite the divine and the human. All pagan mythology was an attempt to incarnate divinity and to deify humanity—a half-conscious prophecy that God must become man if men were ever to become the children of God. And yet when He in whom dwelt the fullness of the Godhead bodily was declared to them as the One through whose resurgent power man might be enthroned in glory, they turned madly away from Him. The light for which Socrates cried in agony, shone not into their hearts when the full Sun of Righteousness dawned upon the world. The mystery to which the Stoics and Epicureans each thought they had the clue, the one in stolid pride, the other in unbridled indulgence —the mystery of man's happiness, which could be solved historically only by the resurrection from the dead—*remained* a mystery for them. For the resurrection of Christ was laughed at, and Paul departed from Athens, leaving the sphynx and the griffin on the helmet of Minerva, to say, "You have closed your eyes to the True Light of the world; now solve the riddle for yourselves or die."

It is wonderful to look back at the history of Athens and see what a crisis—what an era making epoch—the departure of Paul made in the annals of that once proud city. The decline which had already commenced, went on so rapidly from this point, that eighty short years found her in utter desolation. Already her political supremacy was a matter of the past, so that foreign kings no longer sought the title of "citizens" for their children, and her commerce had gone in large measure to Corinth. But now the last and brightest star in the crown of her glory was to be dimmed Her academies of philosophy—the fountains from which imperial Rome had drawn her inspirations—were superseded by the Christian schools at Tarsus where Paul was born, and at Alexandria, where St. Mark took the poor cobbler for his first pupil. Athenian glory had passed away forever, and the ghost of her greatness wailed like a lost spirit around the Acropolis.

And how was it with the Apostle? Was his mission a failure? In answering these questions, we may use the language of the historian whom we have already had occasion to quote: "Whatever may have been the immediate results of St. Paul's sojourn at Athens, its real fruits are those which remain to us still. That speech on the Areopagus is an imperishable monument of the first victory of Christianity over Paganism. To make a sacred application of the words used by the Athenian historian, it was 'no mere effort for a moment' but it is a 'perpetual possession,' wherein the church finds ever fresh supplies of wisdom and guidance. It is in Athens we learn what is the highest point to which unassisted human nature can attain; and here we learn also the language which the Gospel addresses to man on his proudest eminence of unaided strength. God, in His Providence, has preserved to us, in fullest profusion, the literature which unfolds to us all the life of the Athenian people, in its glory and its shame; and he has ordained that one conspicuous passage in the Holy Volume should be the speech in which His servant addressed that people as ignorant idolaters, called them to repentance, and warned them of judgment. And it can hardly be deemed profane if we trace to the same Divine Providence the preservation of the very imagery that surrounded the speaker—not only the sea, and the mountains, and the sky, which change not with the decay of nations, but even the very temples, which remain after wars and revolutions, on their ancient pedestals, in astonishing perfection. We are thus provided with a poetic and yet truthful commentary on the words that were spoken once for all at Athens; and art and nature have been commissioned from above, to enframe the portrait of that Apostle, who stands forever on the Areopagus as the teacher of the Gentiles."*

God has never condemned human wisdom as wisdom, but he has humbled it by reducing it to subserviency. It could never find Him out to perfection. He must reveal himself to man if man is to know Him at all; and one lesson with which He sought to impress the world is that its wisdom must sit as a disciple, not stand as a critic of the disclosure He has made. He has never condemned art as art; He has not said that we must eat and drink to His glory and yet that the whole sphere of our æsthetic nature can find no room for activity in the sphere of our spiritual being. But "a religion that addresses itself only to the taste of man is as weak as one that addresses itself only to the intellect." It has no real power to raise men above the present order of the world.

Among the Greeks the highest wisdom and beauty culminated in the service of their gods; but they deified vice. Lascivious Venus had more votaries than chaste Juno, Bacchus more than Apollo, and the people became so sensual that Athenian immorality became as proverbial as Athenian cultivation. Alcibiades the model citizen was a notorious profligate, and the greatest philosopher of his times denounced the gods as too impure for human companionship.

The general lesson which we here learn is the insufficiency of human culture to raise man up to God, to take away sin or clothe him with holiness. It might as well hope to overcome the law of mortality. After it has done its best, it finds that it belongs to an order of things that is deciduous and crumbling, and that it must accept of the higher power brought into the service of humanity or else fall back from all its vauntings to destruction.

---

* Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul. Vol. I. Pp. 381-382.

Men may have Utopian dreams of what the civilization of the world is to do for our humanity. They may think that the ideal republic of Plato is to be realized, and what God has done for us in Christ may be excluded as an element of help or of hope. The supernatural constitution of grace let down from heaven in the person of God's dear Son, may be so undervalued and ignored, that its withdrawal might not be considered as great a calamity as some other things. It was so with the Athenians. Once during the Peloponnesian war, news came of their defeat on the Asiatic coast and "no one slept in Athens that night." Once before during that same war a plague broke out in the city, and all the streets, and the five mile passage, between the long walls that ran down to the Piraeus, were covered with those whose spotted flesh and swollen tongues told only of death. Then it was, if we have read the history aright, that they called on all the gods on Olympus in vain and when the pestilence was abated they, in gratitude, erected the altar to an *unknown god.* But the departure of the messenger who came to declare to them that unknown God, kept no one from festal joys. That night the city reflected its glory in the water like a proud bride looking into her mirror, and no one thought of the coming or going of the Apostle. Perhaps some young philosopher wondered what had become of the earnest stranger from the Levant, and whether he would again attempt to impose upon their credulity by preaching Jesus, or how he would try to reduce the resurrection to scientific conditions. That, it may be, was all that was said. And yet the departure of Paul sealed the doom of the people—left them gazing at ice-bergs that shone but could give no light; left them like famishing men in a banqueting hall before tables laden with flowers which could not appease hunger, and must fade like any perishing thing of earth—a wondrous illustration of the fact, that while God will bless any individual who believes on him—an Areopagite like Dionysius, or a woman like Damaris—yet multitudes and cities can have no hope if they turn away from the Gospel of His Son.

ART. VII—HAS MAN SPIRITUAL PERCEPTION?

BY GEO. N. ABBOTT.

IN order that no reader may be disappointed, let it be understood at the outset that I do not propose to answer the above question. There is, however, great interest, sometimes, in questions which we cannot answer immediately. A spirit of inquiry is doubtless one of the greatest promoters of philosophy; which in fact, is said to have its origin in wonder. Rightly to interrogate nature is one of the most effective methods of extracting her secrets; and the lawyer often makes his most convincing argument in questioning the witnesses. I will not, however, in this instance pretend to have arrived at that advanced stage of inquiry where the inquirer, peering through the clearing mist of uncertainty, and catching glimpses of the brightening truth, can put his interrogatries in such a manner as to indicate mentally reserved assertions; using the question-form simply for the sake of modesty; but whoever may think to spend a few minutes over this essay must expect only the satisfaction arising from sympathy with one earnestly *desirous* to know what are the proper functions of man's higher intelligence.

It might, perhaps, be expected that one, even in the most dubious attempt at methodic inquiry, should be able at least to define his own terms; but there are cases, it seems to me, where to do even so much is very difficult; and a natural case of this sort would be where the existence or non-existence of something as yet unknown is in question. Suppose, for instance, that the probability of the discovery of a type of being between the gorilla and man were under discussion; who could be expected to predict at what point of intermediateness the first discovered specimen of the new being would appear, or in what particular an advance on the structure of the lower order would be most prominent. If an animal should be found with an intermediate-sized brain, or with a considerable power of speech, or even with a decidedly anthropoid foot, and a habit of "walking uprightly," either of these characters would doubtless entitle it to be ranked as an intermediate being. Here a certain range of indeterminateness would attach to the very object to be looked for. On the other hand, if the question were, whether a certain plant could be successfully grown to the north of a given isothermal, the kind of plant forming the subject of the question might be as definite in all respects as the name of any species in an affirmative proposition.

Now it might be supposed that the mere terms of the question set down as a heading need involve no more indeterminateness than attaches to the name of a cereal species; but when it is remembered that the spiritual, as something absolutely heterogeneous to the natural, is by some at the present time seriously held in doubt, may it not be reasonable to leave the absolute nature of the spiritual somewhat undetermined, at least until special ground shall appear for making a determination. But whatever may be the distinction, or lack of distinction, between material essence, psychic essence, and spiritual essence, a spiritual perception, in order to have any distinctive character, should be in some sense supersensuous, should have objects not accessible to sight, hearing, or touch, or to any power of apprehension usually co-ordinated with these. But here, again, whether such supersensuous power of cognition should be purely a psychic or spiritual one, independent of nerves and brain, or whether the psychic itself be always conditioned by nerves and brain, may perhaps be left as undecided as the similar points above mentioned.

As respects the general notion of *perception*, most persons, I suppose, regard their perceptions of objects as immediate or direct cognitions of them. There does not seem to be any process of reasoning between the sight of an object moving along the road and the *perception* of a horse. But suppose I am in a region of country where mules are about as common as horses; and that I am a quarter of a mile from the road. In such a situation, if I see a wagon moving behind what I immediately judge to be a draught animal, I may hesitate about pronouncing the draught animal a horse, until I have strained my eye-sight to take as accurate an impression of it as the circumstances will permit; and even then I may be compelled to leave the question undecided. In such a case, then, what my perceptive faculty would decide upon instanter in a place where only horses are used as draught animals on the highway, the same faculty would seem to decide less promptly in circumstances where nicer discrimination is to be used.* Still, in the ordinary use of the term *perception*, we, no doubt, mean a seemingly immediate cognition of objects; that is, such a cognition as is possible without a conscious process of reasoning or inference; however much of latent reasoning there may be involved in every mental act above the most elementary impressions of sense. Whatever be the theory of perception, it is evidently capable of cultivation; and the more it is cultivated, the more extensive and reliable will be its activity.

Now although philosophers generally distinguish between sensation and perception, it is still true that perceptions, at least in many cases, cling to, or cohere with, sensations; so that the special organs of sensation become in a manner the organs of perception. Thus, we perceive tones through the ear; and we say a person has an *ear* for music, meaning that his ear makes fine discriminations between musical tones. We say, too, that a person has a good *eye* for colors, and a delicate *taste* for flavors, as if the fine perceptions indicated were incorporated in the special sense-organs; while yet the psychologist tells us that, "in the eye, it is no longer ray of light, nor is it yet color; in the ear, it is no longer wave of air, nor yet is it sound; it is solely a content in the eye or the ear, out of which an intellectual energy will produce a color or a sound. As yet it stands wholly in the living organism, and has not come out in the consciousness, and is the same thing for either blind instinct or a clear perceiving." Thought, in these cases, does its work so quickly, and with so little effort, that we credit the ear and eye with doing all the work; and possibly with greater justice than those admit who make the bodily organ a mere servant or instrument of the mind. At all events the sense-organ through which a percept is obtained seems to stamp a character on the per-

---

*Some regard a percept as a mere *intuition*, having no particular relation to a name or species. But it will be found that the conscious determinations of a nameless intuition involve the same discriminative judgments which are roughly hinted at in the given example.

cept. It not seldom happens, too, that percepts from the same objects do not even harmonize aesthetically with each other. A fine singer is by no means sure to have a beautiful countenance; nor is a bird of beautiful plumage certain to possess an enchanting song. The peacock, you remember, when enviously desiring the notes of the nightingale, was told that "Not all good things are conferred upon one." It makes a diffierence, then, through what sense-avenue we form our acquaintance with an object. Were we to know the nightingale only through its plumage, and the peacock through its vocal utterance, we should put a very different estimate on the attractions of both from what we do by a different mode of acquaintance.

In this view it becomes of some importance to know how many and what are the organized avenues or channels through which the mind acquires percepts In childhood I was taught that man has five senses; but in these latter days men have become dissatisfied with the old land-marks of science, and several additions to the recognized senses have been proposed. Two or three years ago, Dr. Raymond delivered a lecture* in New York on the "Seven Senses,"—disclaiming, by the way, that the views he set forth were either new or original. The sixth sense he called the "Muscular Sense;" its function being to bring to consciousness the strain or effort of muscular contraction or exercise. His seventh sense was called the "Associated Sense, or the Sense of Association;" its office being, as I should understand him, to correlate and coördinate the action of the other senses, so as to give unity to their various intimations. In other words, the business of this seventh organ seems to be to have a sense of what the other senses are about, and to interpret or rectify their single impressions which otherwise, from their one-sidedness or partiality, might lead to false perceptions.

Another authority, too, gives us seven senses; but the two additional ones do not correspond with those just mentioned. Dr. K. V. Stoy, professor at Heidelberg, adds to the list of five senses the sense of temperature, and that of pressure. The sense of pressure would seem to be closely related to the muscular sense, or sense of muscular tension; but Dr. Stoy appears to make a distinction between them, without, however, erecting the latter to a special sense.

---

*See Tribune Extra, No. 5.

These brief references will suffice to show the fact, that there is no longer a universal agreement about the special channels of communication which exist between the mind and the objective world. We will not stop at present to consider why men of science should differ on such a point as the number of senses belonging to man. That a greater number than five was thought of before the present generation, as possible to some beings, is well shown by a passage which the lecturer above mentioned quotes from Voltaire; in which "an inhabitant of Saturn is asked by a traveler from Sirius, 'How many senses have you in Saturn?'" and gets for an answer, "We have seventy-two, and we mourn every day of our lives that we have not more." It is certain that sensation is greatly varied in the different grades of the animal kingdom. Says Tyndall: "In the lowest organisms we have a kind of tactual sense diffused over the entire body; then, through impressions from without and their corresponding adjustments, special portions of the surface become more responsive to stimuli than others. The senses are nascent, the basis of all of them being that simple tactual sense which the sage Democritus recognized 2300 years ago as their common progenitor. The action of light, in the first instance, appears to be a mere disturbance of the chemical processes in the animal organism, similar to that which occurs in the leaves of plants. By degrees the action becomes localized in a few pigment cells, more sensitive to light than the surrounding tissue. The eye is here incipient. At first it is merely capable of revealing differences of light and shade produced by bodies close at hand. Followed as the interception of the light is in almost all cases by the contact of the closely adjacent opaque body, sight in this condition becomes a kind of 'anticipatory touch.' The adjustment continues; a slight bulging out of the epidermis over the pigment granules supervenes. A lens is incipient, and, through the operation of infinite adjustments, at length reaches the perfection that it exhibits in the hawk and eagle. So of the other senses; they are special differentiations of a tissue which was originally vaguely sensitive all over."*

---

*Address before the British Association at Belfast (1874).

The sense organs are not, then, to be looked at merely as highly condensed sets of optical, chemical, acoustic, etc., apparatus, inserted ready-made in the animal structure; for though this is doubtless one view that can be taken, yet it is equally true that they are outgrowths from a central subject reaching out in all directions for communion with the surrounding world. It does not seem to be certain, either, that the senses have in man or any animal as yet come to the highest practicable perfection. How are we certain that what is effected by supplementing human sight with optical instruments could not be accomplished through a higher perfection of the simple organ of vision? We know indeed that great differences of visual power exist—some eyes having a microscopic, and others a telescopic character; and that these characters, as well as the greatly variable degrees of clearness, are liable to great changes with the progress of individual life. A greater clearness than any eye possesses, along with a greater adjustability of the several parts, might, for aught we know, give to the naked eye a power as much beyond that now possessed as the latter is beyond the power of the rudimentary visual organ of the snail.

A farther suggestion with regard to the possible variability of perception through sense may be got from a consideration of the undulatory theory, which most scientists at present adopt as a basis for the conception of sensation. A low rate of wave-motion, ranging say from 16 to 38,000 vibrations per second, affects the consciousness through the sense of hearing, giving the phenomenon *sound.* A higher rate is perceived, it is supposed, in electrical sensation; a still more rapid oscillation is recognized as heat; beyond heat in the upward scale is light; and beyond light, chemical action.* It is not meant that each kind of sensation in succession takes up the scale exactly where another leaves it, but only that in a general way this may be the order of maximum sensations of the given kinds. Now it is not so easy to see why sound, for instance, should not be extended over a greater range; so that the ear might appreciate tones of a lower or higher pitch than it does. That *some* ears can indeed do so appears from observation of animals. It is said to have been shown that "the ear of a calf is so constructed that the lowest sounds only are heard, and that its limit must necessarily be beneath ours;" and that many insects "both hear and produce sounds shrill beyond our cognizance." At the same time the hearing of some persons is limited to a considerably narrower range of pitch than the one designated. "The squeak of the bat, the sound of a cricket, even the chirrup of the common house-sparrow, are unheard by some people who for lower sounds possess a sensitive ear.* Wollaston mentions a curious experiment among several persons with a series of small pipes; different individuals in succession finding the limit of their perception of sound. It appears, thus, that the limits of pitch are subjective, not objective; and it would seem that undulations of all conceivable velocities could be apprehended as sound, if only a hearing organ of sufficient range of perception could be developed.

---

*See Tribune Extra, No. 5. Sound and Hearing, by Prof. Louis Elsberg.

But difference of perceptional range is not confined to the ear; it belongs to the eye as well. It is said not to be unusual to meet with persons lacking a clear perception of red, the *base* tone of color. Other cases seem to indicate indistinct perception of the higher optical tones. But whatever differences of sight there may be at either limit, no eye with which we are acquainted takes in the whole solar spectrum. The lower heat rays and the upper chemical rays make no cognizable impression on the visual organ; though there is every reason to believe that a similar organ of greater range might utilize these rays, either in extending the list of colors or, as is considered more probable, in repeating the spectral tints both above and below what is for us the visible spectrum.* Thus might light become as universal an object of perception as, a moment ago, it was suggested that sound might become. As all rhythmic motions could in theory be translated into sound, so all could be translated into light. For aught we know to the contrary, too, all motions might be translated into heat, flavor, or odor. Universal, however, as each kind of sensation might be in theory, in practice the sphere of each is quite limited. In every analysis of an object we are obliged to supplement the defective percepts obtained through one sense by those gained through another; and a person lacking any one of these avenues of connection with the external world is apt to exhibit what appear to others distorted or sickly conceptions of things. The difference of impressions through the different senses is such, too, as to suggest almost anything sooner than a likeness of cause for the impressions.

---

*Tyndall on Sound. P. 73.

*"Mr. Stokes has observed that light of certain refrangibility and color is capable of experiencing a peculiar influence in being dispersed by certain media, and of undergoing thereby an alteration of its refrangibility and color. * * * * Thus, rays of so high a degree of refrangibility, that they extend far beyond the extreme limits of the spectrum visible under ordinary circumstances, may be rendered luminous, and converted into blue and even red light." —*Fowne's Chemistry*, *p.* 87.

Besides other differences, that in degree of power to assert objectivity is very prominent. It is natural to ask why light and heat, so closely related that they overlap each other on the solar spectrum, give us, the one a clear presentation of external being, the other only a dark intimation, utterly "without form, and void." May we not innocently imagine that, to beings more perfectly constituted, the sensation of heat, or even that of taste or smell, might give as distinct a rendering of objective existence as sight does to us? The lack of objective assertion in some of the senses leads to a substitution similar to that which a blind person adopts when he reads with his fingers. Our chemical senses, taste and smell, being inadequate for the proper recognition of chemical phenomena, we are compelled to study chemistry by the eye, using, thus, largely indirect and circumstantial evidence of what transpires in our experiment. The connection between the sign and the thing signified becomes, however, so sure and familiar that the indirect evidence scarcely differs from direct, so far as certainty is concerned. If dilute sulphuric acid be poured on what bears a general resemblance to limestone, and effervescence ensues, the opinion that it is limestone gains important confirmation. A change of color from blue to red in litmus paper may be just as good proof of the presence of an acid as the taste of it would be, and in some cases even better. So the form of a crystal is one of the indications of chemical composition. Indeed, perhaps the optical phenomena should not always, strictly speaking, be classed as indirect evidence. For instance, the change of color and the excitement of a taste, as just now referred to, may prove to be essentially the same fact grasped by different senses. The same undulatory influence may possibly affect both color and taste in some way as yet unknown.

But at all events the visual criteria are generally preferred on account of their much greater distinctness. Very few persons have the peculiar perception which the two men are said to have possessed, one of whom detected a flavor of iron, and the other a taste of leather, in wine drawn from a hogshead in the bottom of which was afterwards found an iron key attached to a leather thong. Most men would, I think, be much inclined to distrust a claim to any such refinement of sensibility in the gustatory organ, until, by the force of ocular proof, they should be brought to acknowledge that "seeing is believing." The discovery of iron at the distance of the stars, by the spectroscope, is, doubtless, an easier matter than the detection of a key in a hogshead of wine at our feet by a trial of the liquid on the tongue. Again, we do not trust our sense of temperature to make nice distinctions of heat and cold, but construct an instrument to be observed by the eye. Our instrument, or set of instruments, for this purpose, has the additional advantage of reaching degrees of heat and cold inaccessible to the direct sense-criterion. Within what are called ordinary temperatures, however, direct sense-perception might doubtless be cultivated up to far greater accuracy of discernment than is usually attained.

Another case of the auxiliary use of the eye is in the study of acoustics. The wave-theory of even sound would hardly be demonstrable without the aid of sight. It is the eye that detects the vibration of the string while the ear hears the tone. By an ingenious contrivance burning-gas may be sent past an organ-pipe in such a manner that the pulsations of air in the pipe, as it is sounded, shall impress themselves through an elastic membrane upon the gas-current, and thus occasion a flickering in the flame that is fed by it. Again, by a set of revolving mirrors this flickering flame can be converted into a beautiful ribbon of light with a serrate edge, furnishing a basis for calculating the exact rate of vibrations in the organ-pipe. If a pipe sounding the octave to the first is used, the number of flame-points in the edge of the luminous ribbon will be doubled, showing that the octave note has two vibrations to one of the fundamental note. Here it will be seen that the connection between the serrate ribbon of light and the air-pulsations is unquestionably indirect; the one furnishing quite certain evidence of the other, without being, in any sense, the other in disguise. But the brilliancy of the exhibition is such as to draw attention from persons who would be but indifferently interested in a scientific experiment on tones simply. Even when sound is wrought up into the most charming music, it seems hardly to receive such universal appreciation as brilliant objects of sight. Stage-singers find it necessary to put a considerable amount of action into their performances in order to win the highest popularity; and even instrumental performers add to popular effect by making the movements of the hands and body tell upon the eye of the listener. In dreams, where the sense-forms have the freest play, sights seem to take the lead with almost every one, over all other sense-impressions. Now and then it may occur, as in the case of Rousseau's Dream of Heaven or Coleridge's Kubla Khan, that dreams may take the form of music or poetry; but the great mass of dreams would seem to be of a different character. Indeed, sight would seem to be the special sense of cultivated man. Hearing is, to be sure, of immense use in receiving communications through speech But much of the value of words lies in their symbolization of what can be either physically or mentally intuited. The writer or speaker who addresses vividly the visual imagination is pretty sure to entertain a large proportion of mankind.

But is this state of things with regard to the comparative use of sight strictly necessary? Are we compelled to give such prominence to external vision and to its mental congeners? Allusion has already been made to the fact that the blind can substitute the sense of feeling for sight, learning to distinguish with a quickness which appears to ordinary persons little less than miraculous, the raised letters over which their fingers are passed. Their tactual perception seems to approximate—nay, almost to surpass—the rudimentary vision developed at the ends of the tentacles of some lower animals. Again, the hound pursues his prey by scent; using his olfactory perception with as much apparent objective assurance as if he had the eye of the eagle directed upon his mark. We might easily imagine that, while he so eagerly scents the tracks, he has prominent in his psychic being a visual image of the object of pursuit, and that this visual image is what gives zest to the chase. But are we certain of this? Would it not as well comport with his carnivorous nature to suppose the anticipated *taste* of his prey is what haunts his imagination, and hastens his footsteps? It is not the study of natural history that the dog is pursuing. He may care as little about the external appearance of what he hopes to feast on as the patronizer of a boarding-house does for the color of the ox from which his slice of beef-steak was taken.

If it is to be objected on Vergil's principle: "So you bees make honey not for yourselves," that the dog hunts in the interest of his master, and not with the immediate expectation of appropriating the results of his own labors, it may be replied that this is only one of the numerous instances in which man turns to his own account the agencies of nature, while yet nature acts obediently to her own laws; and that an animal's use of his senses is to be interpreted chiefly in the light of his primitive nature and condition, at least in so far as no reason exists for a different interpretation. The dog belongs to a family of animals, many of which are gifted with a power of pursuing by scent, and often himself, in a cultivated state, hunts in this way for his own individual benefit. In default of a better knowledge of animal psychology, may we not theorize that probably he distinguishes objects largely, on an epicurean principle, through considerations of pleasure and pain, rather than by the pure unselfish light of the Platonic idea? and that, hence, his *marks* of a given animal or vegetable would be, in general, quite different from those by which a zoologist or botanist thinks of the same? This suggestion is not necessarily negatived by the fact that animals often use the same senses as ourselves in discovering their objects of interest; as when the eagle and the grey-hound sight their prey. The thought does not need to follow closely and exclusively the lead of the sense employed. The lumber-dealer and the botanist may look at an old pine forest with equally absorbed eye-sight; the one having in his mind's eye visions of money, the other, hundreds of concentric layers of growth. The same fountain may send out streams in different directions; and in like manner the same sensation may be the starting-point of different thought-currents. A similar cultivation of the senses is equally available for a variety of purposes. To be able to grasp the perspective of a landscape is as useful to a railway engineer as to a painter of natural scenery; and if either of these personages were found without his significant instruments, peering into the distance, it might be quite impossible to judge from appearances whether his imagination was indulging in a train of beautiful imagery, or in a train of freight-cars. The cultivation of a nice perception of distant objects is equally necessary for the sailor and the rifleman; and a fine discrimination of colors belongs as well to to the useful art of dyeing as to the fine art of painting.

Not only is it true that the same kind of sense-perception may take different turns in thought and action, but substantially the same thought may have been variously initiated; so that in a given case a certain form of knowledge or mode of cognition may have a questionable origin. How many persons in mature life remember whether they first learned to read mostly by hearing pronounced those combinations of letters which form words—that is, by the "word-method;" or by the "phonetic method" were taught the elementary sounds and their combinations into words in connection with the representation of sounds by letters; or by a more laborous self-exertion they spelled out their reading from syllable to syllable; or by the labor-saving pictorial method, amusing them selves with a pictured "ape," "boy," "cat," and so on down to "zebra," they conned the lettered names along with the portraits. The mist about the morning horizon of memory bedims many an inception of mental activity. We know something of how we commence and pursue our planned investigations, but how we came by the knowledge we had of subjects before investigation, is the obscure problem; a problem, too, that covers a large share of the mental treasures of the race; for few undertake to assure themsolves of the truth of their views by methodic research. Indeed, the work of retracing the course of one's own intellectual development back to its primitive percepts bears a resemblance to reviewing a book of science whose first pages, containing the statements of principles, have been worn out and are gone. To theorize about how one would proceed to acquire what time has given him in a great measure unconsciously involves many liabilities to error; and an attempt to repeat past experiences of cognition *de novo* is very likely to substitute unwittingly old and complex impressions for new and simple ones.

Then again, the observation of the psychic phenomena of children or of young animals, though capable of furnishing valuable evidence, is yet far from sure to result in correct theories; because, among other reasons, the gaps of observation may be variously filled by the fantasy of the observer. Besides, there are cases where even careful attention fails to determine with certainty how the psychic movement links itself with what is externally evidenced.

Considering all the difficulties, it does not seem very strange that modern philosophy should have got in a muddle about the origin of such an idea as "outness," or distance (*i. e.* from the subject), including the so-called "third dimension" of solidity; Berkeley and many after him assigning to it an origin in tactual perception exclusively, while others still hold that distance and all spatial relations are recognized through the eye. One might imagine that an observation of a chicken of tenderest age pecking at its food with the precision of a sharp-shooter, and adapting the nervous stimulus to the required range of movement as if it had studied the dynamics of nerve-force, would settle the question. But some of the best physiologists are of opinion that the human infant does not take a "bird's-eye view" of things; and hence that analogy in this case is not a safe guide. The eye of the infant, in other words, is supposed to be less mature than that of many of the lower animals, as regards a power to suggest distance. An argument to strengthen this supposition is drawn from cases in which persons old enough to describe their own experiences intelligibly have come into possession of sight for the first time through a surgical operation. In such cases, it is said that a proper appreciation of distance is wanting until after a considerable use of the newly-opened eyes, in connection with that of the tactile and muscular senses.

On the other hand, the author of a recent work on psychology urges it, among his objections to the wave-theory of light, that it makes sight too purely subjective, and does not harmonize with that distinctness of externality and solidity which, in his view, characterize intrinsically the perceptions of sight; notwithstanding the fact that disciplinary experience is necessary to the correct estimate of dimensions and distances.

But Berkeley seems not to have been satisfied with denying to sight a power of apprehending the so-called third dimension (including all distances in the line of the visual axis); but in regard to those remaining attributes a cognizance of which is commonly accredited to both sight and touch he remarks: "The extensions, figures, and motions perceived by sight are specifically distinct from the ideas of touch called by the same names; nor is there any such thing as an idea, or kind of idea, common to both senses."* Even this seemingly strange statement is said to find apparent confirmation, too, in cases of persons born blind, to whom sight has been imparted by an operation. Instances are given of such persons being unable to recognize by sight objects which they were before familiar with by the sense of feeling, until after repeated experience in coördinating the two kinds of sense-impressions. An account of the case of a young woman who had been blind from birth, written by the operator who procured for her the enjoyment of sight, speaking of her difficulty in recognizing objects by sight alone, and of her need of comparing the visual and tactual characters, thus making her educated sense instruct her inexperienced one, remarks: "It was curious to place before her some very familiar object that she had never compared in this way, such as a pair of scissors. She would describe their shape, color, glistening metallic character, but would fail in ascertaining what they really were, until she put a finger on them, when in an instant she would name them, and laugh at her own stupidity, as she called it, in not having made them out before."† The youth whom Cheselden couched for cataract is also related one day to have taken up in his arms a cat which he had not yet learned to distinguish from a dog by sight, though he knew them both well by touch, and after feeling her attentively so as to associate the two sets of cognitions, to have put her down, saying, "So, puss; I shall know you another time."

But such confusions of the testimony of the two senses, one of which is a new and almost untried acquisition, may prove very little with regard to the essential likeness or unlikeness of the data they furnish: especially when we know that the untutored eye can be similarly confused in making what we should regard as a very simple comparison of visual objects alone; it having been credibly recorded that certain Australians " were quite unable to realize the most vivid artistic representations," that " on being shown a picture of one of themselves, one said it was a ship, another a kangaroo, not one in a dozen identifying the portrait as having any connection with himself;" and, what is still more remarkable, it having occurred that intelligent individuals, mistaking a mirror for a door or a picture, have critically surveyed their own persons, regarding them as altogether foreign to themselves; an art critic in one case going so far as to analyze his own character from a reflection which he took to be a portrait.

---

*See Huxley, Critiques and Addresses, p. 303.

†Cited by Carpeter, Mental Physiology, p. 189, from *Medico-Chirurgical Transactions.* Vol. XXXVIII.

No doubt, the percepts coming through the different senses have their unique phases; but it is questionable whether such general notions as those of distance, figure, and motion need retain any *essential* peculiarities from the fact of their having been in any particular case perceived or estimated through a particular sense-organ For instance, why need there be a mental difference between ten rods measured by the eye, and ten rods measured by pacing the ground with the eyes closed, provided the two measures chance to agree?

Taking now a retrospect of what has been said thus far, it might seem that our thought has made a complete turn-about since it was stated that the sense-organ through which a percept is obtained stamps a character on the percept; and that it makes a difference through what sense-avenue we form our acquaintance with an object. Our latest inferences, that the same sense-impression may suggest different thoughts, and that the same general conception may have been suggested by different sense-impressions, appear to point towards a possibility of doing without even so many senses as are ordinarily claimed for man, and to hint at the notion that a single sense of sufficient range might do all the work. But the *sufficient range* is a very important consideration. The oscillatory theory of sensation, before alluded to, gives us to understand how very small the entire range from the slowest-waving sensible sound to the swiftest-quivering perceptible light is, when compared with the whole of a scale that should exhaust the variation of numbers. The word *etherial* is, perhaps, not fine enough to suggest the nature of the medium through which the higher-pitched thrills of nature may be transmitted.

The question may naturally arise, then: *Have we an unnamed sense or set of senses for perceiving those intensely rapid thrills?*

In a universal spectrum, far above the super-luminous chemical rays, *may* be the *vital* rays, or the vital *tones;* which, indeed, may not be limited to this high pitch, but may shade down through chemism, light, heat, etc., till they find their sub-base in the rhythmic pulse-waves, and breath-flucts. Mark, I do not say it is so; but it *may* be so. And if the Platonic *self-motion* (*αὐτοκίνησις*) be allowed as the characteristic of psychic activity, then thought itself may involve wave-motions of exceeding great rapidity, and may thus require to be apprehended through an appreciation of such high-toned music. The expression "to hear one's self think" would, in this view, come to be almost more than pure metaphor.

Now of course any such wave-hypothesis, extending over vitality and thought, would be entirely provisional; but adopting it for the purpose of a brief consideration of consequences we see:

(1) All sense-perceptions, including the hypothetical psychic order, would have certain characters and implications in common. All would be in a certain sense tone-perceptions. The man who dwells in the thought-world would, as it were, listen to transcendental strains. Time and space, being essential conditions of all motion however refined, would be implied alike throughout the whole scale. Hence the preception of *spatial dimensions,* with the consequent *figures,* could not *a priori* be assigned to a single sense, but might be distributed to several; and Berkeley could be saved the trouble of proving either *a priori* or *a posteriori* the essential difference between tactual dimensions and visual dimensions; though some *apparent* difference might exist, owing to the imperfection or partial efficiency of all sense organs.

(2) While there might be certain gaps in sense-perception, that is, certain portions of the extensive scale of possible sensa-

sion unoccupied by the function of any sense, there might also occur cases in which the same ground would be occupied by different senses; which seems actually to be illustrated by a partial coincidence of heat and light rays.

(3) As the sense-scale is ascended or descended, a variation of sense-perception must occur, which is illustrated, even within the range of the same sense-organ, by the difference between base and treble tones, as well as by that between red and blue colors. This kind of variation would, very likely, be increased by a successive introduction of new sense-organs, magnifying respectively certain tone-characters or effects, and diminishing or annulling others. Then, by combinations of these differences, an infinitude of variety would result. There would then be no lack of substantial specific differences among percepts.

(4) All natural objects, in so far as they involve capabilities of various motions, would also involve possibilities of exciting various qualities of sensation, which qualities would become the marks* of objects. These marks, in the case of complex objects especially, might be distributed among the functions of several senses. Indeed, it would be easy to think of a complex object as a "harp of a thousand strings," furnishing employment for all the senses at once, when it is set fully in motion. But as a few touches on an instrument are enough for its recognition, objects in nature would often be recognized by a few characters, perhaps appreciable by a single sense; though of course the partiality of presentation in such cases would give a peculiar coloring to our notions of objects, unless previous complementary presentations held in memory should supply the wanting data. A man, for example, might be known by his voice, his step, his countenance, his general figure—by either of these or by all together; but if knowledge of him were limited to a part of these characters, it would make a difference what characters were cognized; as was well illustrated in one case by the disappointment felt by a person who, having no proper use of his eyes in earliest life, knew his friends by other senses; but

---

*Marks might also result from the power in a body to "absorb" or modify motion; as when a body takes its color from an absorption or a modification of a part or the whole of the light falling on it.

afterwards having sight imparted, found them less handsome than he expected.*

In this brief list of deductions from the hypothesis of a general sense scale, we have in substance, as will have been seen, retraced in reverse order the suggestions previously made. This, however, is no proof of the truth of the hypothesis either in detail or in general. Especially in detail there is great liability to error in any unproved scheme. Of course it is understood that the proposed scheme is none of the present writer's, except as regards the bare suggestion that possibly vital and mental activities may involve undulatory motions which, on a general scale of such motions in nature, may have their places in part above those of light and chemism, This suggestion may have in it the least of truth. Even though it be true that thought in its most abstract forms may involve cerebral action, including some sort of undulation of either nerve-matter-nerve-force, or ether in or around the nerve-matter; and that such undulation, or some effect of it, in order to the consciousness of cerebral action, may be transmitted over nerve fibres to the appropriate sensorium, it still will not necessarily follow that the undulation will be of the order above suggested. But however this may be, is it at all probable that the maximum of vibratory motion has been already approximately measured by science? Is it likely that nature so far consults the convenience of human modes of numeration as to avoid any movements requiring to be expressed by unsuitably long rows of figures? or that she is so considerate towards human mechanism as to refrain from cutting up space and time into such atomic fragments as can not be measured by instruments? If nature be thus cautious about over-stepping the boundaries of easy computation, may we not hope that human science will soon compass all her doings? If, on the contrary, she sets no such bounds for herself, limiting her activity only by keeping within the intrinsically possible, then there will be in such wave-theories as those of heat, light, etc., an implication of a vast range of unexplored possibilities which, nevertheless, nature herself may have utilized.

It will have been observed that all that has, thus far, been directly suggested in the way of spiritual perception does not go beyond introspection into the subject's own mental activity. Whatever be the normal place for introspection in a properly graded perceptional series, it seems natural to give it the first mention among cognitions of psychic objects; because what takes place within the psychic subject seems to offer the nearest phenomena not usually classed as material; provided the psychic activities of the subject *are phenomena*, that is, *possible objects of direct cognition.* Now this very point appears to be denied by some, so that we are refused perceptional admission to even the vestibule of the spiritual edifice. The author* of a series of articles in the Journal of Speculative Philosophy, written in a style of admirable explicitness, asserts:

---

*Library of Natural History, edited by A. A. Gould, p. 38.

"We have no power of Introspection, but all knowledge of the internal world is derived by hypothetical reasoning from our knowledge of external facts."

Were this statement less perspicuously worded, we might be inclined to soften down the meaning to something like this: Our self-inspection has not the directness of external observation, and may in some sense be compared to our looking towards the mirror of a reflecting telescope, to see an object behind us. That is, there is somewhat of reflectiveness in all self-cognition. But this is not what the writer intends. He seems to mean rather that the way in which we stand affected by our relations to known external objects furnishes a criterion for our inferential judgment with regard to ourselves. If we find ourselves predicating, This object is good, that one vile; this one is beautiful, that ugly; this is red, that blue; we have in these judgments of ours upon these familiar objects grounds of inference about our own make-up. All this is, doubtless, quite true so far as it goes; but how do we know that these judgments about objects are our judgments? Is it not knowing something of myself to know that I am uttering a judgment, whatever its character? It is the radiant object that we see, and the mind radiates in its judgments. Instruments help to analyze radiance, and thus to refine our knowledge of its sources. So by carefully filtering or sifting our judgments through external objects we may get the means of improving our self-acquaintance. But we can see the sun shine if we do not distinguish in it hydrogen, iron, sodium, etc.; and so we can perceive that the ego thinks, though all the subtleties about the manner of thinking may not at once be apparent.

---

*C. S. Peirce. See Jour. Spec. Phil. Vol. II.

Possibly one other criticism on the use of the term *introspection* may be admissible. Like so many of our figurative names for various cognitions, it carries the notion of *ocular* perception. By the too exclusive use of terms of this order, we are sometimes led to question a proposed cognition in case it be not "as plain as day." We have seen in our discussion that not all radiance is luminous. Neither is every significant self-utterance as plain as daylight. If the child does not so early recognize in the hot stove a ray-emitting substance as it does in the gas-flame, because not born with its thermal eyes open, it will be pretty sure in time to "come to its senses" so as to perceive the one fact just as *certainly* as the other, if not just as *clearly*. And the fact that it does not say "*I*" so soon as it does other words is not so much proof of the lack of any ground of direct self-cognition as of the present obscurity clouding its perception, which, clearing up by time, will leave the ego to be apprehended by no very round-about method.

In order to do better justice to the writer just now referred to, I ought, perhaps, to quote one other of his general conclusions, as it may shed some light on the one above discussed. "We have no power of Intuition, but every cognition is determined logically by previous cognitions."

Such a sweeping denial of the existence of an intuitive function at all would seem to include the non-existence of introspection; so that but one proof would appear to be required. But the author of these propositions regards introspection as "not necessarily intuitive;" though he says he means by it "a direct perception of the internal world, but not necessarily a perception of it *as* internal." This definition taken as a whole appears to indicate that *direct evidence* of any kind is what is wanting with respect to the ego; while, in the case of objects generally, not so much do we experience a lack of directness of evidence as a want of cumulative sufficiency at any one instant of time or point of space, to furnish the ground of an instantaneous presentation. In other words, the evidence comes piece-meal, and has to be combined into a unity by mental inference. The writer's view can best be illustrated by a quotation from his argument on objective intuition: "A man can distinguish different textures of cloth by feeling; but not immediately, for he requires to move his fingers over the cloth, which shows that he is obliged to compare the sensations of one instant with those of another."

"The pitch of a tone depends upon the rapidity of the succession of the vibrations which reach the ear. Each of those vibrations produces an impulse upon the ear. Let a single such impulse be made upon the ear, and we know, experimentally, that it is perceived.* There is, therefore, good reason to believe that each of the impulses forming a tone is perceived. Nor is there any reason to the contrary; so that this is the only admissible supposition. Therefore, the pitch of a tone depends upon the rapidity with which certain impressions are conveyed to the mind. These impressions must exist previously to any tone; hence, a sensation of pitch is determined by previous cognitions."

The sum of the matter appears to be that objects furnish only more or less scattered and unsystematized data, which the mind tries to gather up and construct into a unity of presentation, *supplying lacks* of impressions, as in the case of the "blind spot on the retina," from its own store of cognitions.

Now what I would ask is to have this in general admirably stated theory of inferential perception extended to the ego, in common with all other objects.† The stock or stone is not, to be sure, allowed to judge its own case; but it is permitted to *testify* in its own case; and we draw inferences from this testimony as valid, if not complete. Why then should the ego be allowed to say nothing of itself? Why should it, if brought into court at all, be brought

---

*The difficulty here, however, is to be certain that we have a *single* impulse. Applying the edge of a card to a rapidly turning toothed wheel will furnish a tone, formed by the successive strokes of the teeth against the card. But the single strokes also probably give short tones, though perhaps often undistinguishable as such.

†If after all, the writer referred to, in denying to the mind a power of introspection, only means in substance to deny that one, taking as it were for a guide a sort of intellectual lantern, can survey the inner chambers of his being, and take an inventory of his powers and faculties in the state of quiet slumber, I certainly have no quarrel with him.

only to show its pleasure or disgust, its interest or indifference towards certain objects? The behavior of objects towards each other does indeed form an important class of data for judging of them. The more sensitive any object to the presence of others, the more valuable, in general, is the testimony given. The ego being an exceedingly sensitive object, at least in the ego's own view, may thus form a very fit subject for this kind of experimenting. But why should not the ego be the primary, rather than the secondary object in the case?

Perhaps the right of the ego to give testimony in its own case can be better seen in view of the fact that, beyond the reach of touch, nature generally appears to present, as it were, her psychic side to our senses. Light is not a mere placid and motionless medium, but a living activity. Stöckhardt, in his Chemistry, says:* "As we discern in ourselves the visible body, and its ruler, the invisible spirit, so we recognize in external nature bodies which we can handle and weigh, and *forces* and *powers* ruling these bodies and having no weight." He thus recognizes a psychic and an anti-psychic character as distributed throughout the universe. In calling the anti-psychic the visible he uses the language of common life. The almanac, though the work of science, says on the same principle that the sun rises and sets. Take away what he calls *forces* and *powers* from what he calls *bodies*, and how many sensations should we ever after get from the latter? Is it not quite as truly the force of gravity that we weigh as it is the body which that force "rules?" Of course we are not to separate body and force otherwise than as two opposed polarities of the same entity; but the term *body*, in so far as it is a symbol for spent force or force in equilibrium, will, if unmoved by any foreign force, and if we let it rest, and do not by any force of ours disturb its equilibrium, rarely exhibit any very striking phenomena to our senses.

It is not the cold, dull iron, but the iron roused by the powerful force of heat until its particles fairly quiver with excitement, that glows to the eye like sunshine. Less animated with caloric force, it sends out genial rays of warmth. Water, too, on being highly heated, exhibits a force directly correlated to the muscular sense.

---

* P. 21.

When properly *embodied* in this heated state, it becomes almost an ego, doing the muscle-work of a multitude of men,—work which costs man expense of psychic energy. In the form of steam, then, water is revealed as power or force; and in this force-form how do we imagine it to be exalted to kinship with what generates our own motions. Even when the falling water turns the wheel, the force of gravity is the real phenomenon. It was a scintillation from the same force that shot into the mind of Newton at the moment of the apple's fall. As soon as this ever-living force was fairly perceived, the principles of all free motion, terrestrial and celestial, began to be revealed. Indeed, *energy*, instead of being, as conceived from an old stand-point, something naturally latent or hidden, is really the only thing known. Science never flourished until it directed its attention to forces and energies—to the live side of existence. Motion is conceived to be everywhere. The hum of business would be heard in the flint and the diamond, if our physical ear were like the ear of science. The atom, the last relic of unyielding solidity, will probably in the end melt away, and evaporate into the transparencies of number and order.

Since this change of tactics the success of science has been wonderful. Not more sure is that embodiment of force, nitro-glycerine, to tunnel the solid mountain than is a proper conception of forces to penetrate and light up the opacities of being. It is pleasant in this connection to read the words of Prof. Balfour Stewart, uttered so lately as August 26, at Bristol, remembering that their author is regarded as one of the best expounders of the just-named conception: "It cannot be doubted that a great generalization is looming in the distance—a mighty law, we can not yet tell what, that will reach us, we can not yet say when. It will involve facts hitherto inexplicable, facts that are scarcely received as such, because they appear opposed to our present knowledge of their cause. It is not possible, perhaps, to hasten the arrival of this generalization beyond a certain point; but we ought not to forget that we can hasten it, and that it is our duty to do so. * * * * * If governments would understand the ultimate material advantage of every step forward in science, however inapplicable each may appear for the moment to the wants or pleasures of ordinary life, they would find reasons patent to the meanest capacities for bringing the wealth of mind, now lost on the drudgery of common labors, to bear on the search for those wonderful laws which govern every movement, not only of the mighty masses of our system, but of every atom distributed throughout space."

One degree of universality of a "mighty law" was indeed already grasped in the Newtonic perception of gravity; but now, it seems, a higher and profounder significance of such a law is "looming up" in the distant mental horizon. It is worth noticing that it is the eventually to be grasped "law" that is to clear up the "hitherto inexplicable" and "hardly received" "*facts*," and not the inexplicable facts that are to enact the law in the first instance. Just in accordance with this view is it that not the elliptic orbital motions of the planets first revealed to Newton the universal law of gravitation; but this law rationalized the otherwise mysterious motions, and "worked out, instantly and absolutely, a complete revolution in the whole science of Astronomy;"* and all this, notwithstanding the fact that Galileo and Kepler had already so mastered by experiment and observation many of the particular phases of motion as to have accurately formulated them, setting their stakes, as it were, by trial just where pure theory was destined to set them; the difference in favor of the latter being, however, that its triumphs were to be at once without limit either in space or time.

Another illustration of the fact that Nature shows herself to advantage on her liveliest side, and in her most animated moods, is given in the case of incandescent metallic vapors, which by virtue of their intense vibratory motions shed their own light; and in this light make their own mark so legible that, whether simple or combined, they can be distinguished through the spectroscope as far as light can fathom distance. But we need not multiply illustrations. We know that every experiment on matter is designed to cause it to display some force or energy, and that it is also designed to make matter more intelligible. We know, too, that the man who frequently performs on himself the experiment of *thinking* is generally better acquainted with himself than one who seldom makes this experiment; and for what better reason than that thinking is a cognizable object? We may have "unconscious cerebration,"* for we leave unnoticed very much that is in itself noticeable; but we certainly do have some conscious cerebration, or *results* of cerebration. Intuitive self-perception in the most literal sense may be wanting, as all intuition in the same sense may be; but that the mind takes successive impressions of its own throbs and thrills cannot really be made more sure by argument. What can be more certain than that one can generally, if called upon, repeat the thought of the last moment with considerable accuracy, although the stimulus or occasion for that thought may no longer exist? Its revival or repetition without a present objective cause shows that some impression, or set of impressions, was made which still lingers; and that it was a cognizable impression must be granted, to account for our knowing what is called for when we are asked to repeat our last thought.

---

* Mitchell, Popular Astronomy, p. 192.

So far, then, as spiritual or psychic self-cognition is concerned, the drift of thought has served to carry us into a forgetfulness of the disclaimer at the outset of an intention to answer the question placed as a heading. Within the sphere of the individual ego, the spiritual appears to be as directly cognizable as any other phenomena. But the question whether man is capacitated for spiritual perception has a much wider application than this subjective one; and it is as to this wider application of the question that a pretty general feeling of ignorance probably prevails. Assuming our position, then, on the apparently firm ground of self-consciousness, we are nevertheless standing on the brink of an uncertain ocean, distrusting our powers of direct vision, by ever so much peering, to discover whether there be life in its depths or pearls on its bottom. "We have heard the fame thereof with our ears;" there is no lack of *testimony;* but would that the billows would waft along one of these phosphorescent tracts in which we might get a glimpse of the truth for ourselves! But is there even phosphorescence for us in the spirit-realm? Is spirit in any proper sense radiant? or is each individual spirit light and self-conscious within, but closed around by windowless walls, cutting off, absolutely, all direct communication? No doubt the common view of men is that, while they know their own thoughts, they, if they please, have these thoughts exclusively to themselves. They have but to bar their own mouths, and all that transpires within is an absolute secret. If this be unqualifiedly so, our question must have a negative answer, so far as one class of spiritual perception is concerned. But only asking that a view more promising to psychic science may have the benefit of the doubt, we may conceive the spiritual, as a possible object of perception, to be divisible into two parts or classes, the personal and the impersonal spiritual —or, in other words, spiritual beings and spiritual truths. These classes would of course admit of subdivision; but as our present consideration of them is to be very brief, it will not be worth while to draw nice distinctions. Possibly it might be objected that there is no impersonal department of the spiritual; and I am not indisposed to allow that there is some force in the objection. Still, from the ordinary stand-point of abstraction, there appears to be a distinction between truth by itself and its personal incorporations.

---

* Keeping up the notion of vibratory cerebration, we might imagine some cerebral activity pitched on too high or too low a key for our perceptive self-consciousness.

For our present purpose spiritual truth may be extended so as to include the purely theoretical side of all science. Using the term *idea* with somewhat less than Hegelian strictness, we may include in the department of spiritual truth the whole region of intellectual ideas. Here there are presented two opposite views: the one maintaining that ideas result wholly from experience; the other, that they are innate. The experimental method of attaining them may be roughly illustrated by the procedure of the bee-hunter, who, after allowing the chance-discovered bee to load itself with the honey in his box, watches the direction it takes in its homeward flight; and, when by repeated trials with this bee and those by which it may afterwards be accompanied, he has well established the direction, carries his box with bees inclosed to another location, and there likewise determines the direction of their home by their flight; and so pursues the same method until, by a kind of rough-cast triangulation, he fixes approximately the place where the treasure he seeks must be located, and then going thither, searches from tree to tree until perchance he finds it. The bees which he has observed have flown in different directions; but there has been unity of aim. Now it is the unity of aim in a variety of phenomena that the philosopher seeks. This gives him, by the *practical* method, an idea or law of the phenomena. By way of example we may recall to mind again the discovery of the principle of gravity. Before the days of Newton it was perceived that the motion of the planets in elliptic orbits round the sun involved, for some mysterious reason, a deflection of the planets' naturally rectilinear motion *towards the sun;* and that a similar movement of the satellites around the primaries involved a like deflection towards the latter; also, that the fall of bodies towards the earth's centre must have a cause, and that the tides must be due to some agency of the moon. What was lacking was a *unity* of all these indications. A dim presentiment that there might be such a unity seems long to have been felt. What was the full meaning of all these particular tendencies of bodies towards other bodies? The indication was not of course that, as in the case of the bees, all bodies are tending towards some one point in space. The case was not so plain as that. The tendencies were shown, too, for the most part, at any one moment, merely by slight deflections, and not by a direct aim. The complexity of the problem was much increased by this fact. The mental triangulation by which an idea is sought for through the contemplation of phenomena is, thus, more difficult than that employed in bee-hunting. No wonder, then, that years rolled on while philosophers puzzled their brains over the knotty question about the true significance of planetary motions. But at last a unity of perception in some way worked itself out. All the phenomena in the case pointed to the *one fact* that all bodies throughout the universe attract each other precisely on the same principle as the earth attracts the falling apple.

Thus far we have been looking for our central idea from a circumferential stand-point. We have been conceiving of a few external observations as telling circumstantially upon a profound secret at the very heart of nature. That our present view is the one actually accordant with the history of the case may be plausibly argued from the fact that the first partial formulations of the facts regarding motion clung almost as closely to what had been observed as the tables of the average expectation of life do to the statistics of longevity. Kepler's first law of planetary motion, "Every planet revolves in an elliptical orbit around the sun, which occupies the focus," meant, when first made out with reference to the planet Mars, that after long observation of the actual motion, and a tedious trial of successive hypotheses in order to get at some regular shaping of the orbit, the ellipse was finally found to fit the case, and hence was adopted as the type of the planetary courses; but did not mean that every body moving under the influence of a central and centrifugal force *must describe one of the conic sections.* The latter is a pure theoretical deduction, and came later in the history of science, which is just what the experimental theory of the origin of ideas would seem to require.

But while the generalization of experience may furnish ground for a pretty fair theory of scientific cognition, especially if ancestral experience be taken into the account as handed down to descendants in the form of what might be termed ready-made experience; yet there are interesting phases of the subject from other points of view. Indeed it might be imagined that the bare fact of looking for a unity of significance in phenomena implies a preconception, dim perhaps, of the unit-idea. It probably only requires a sufficiently general mode of analysis to bring an answer out of every intelligible problem; and so the ability to state the problem has great significance. The spirit of inquiry which men indicate to some extent almost everywhere may be imagined to issue from a mental substrate of embryonic ideas struggling to come to the light. But, at all events, there occur now and then instances of striking facility in the development of ideas, such as naturally to suggest either an unacquired knowledge or an intuitive acquisition of it. It would in some instances seem as if individuals, by a happy conjuncture, have an ear at a focal point in nature's "Whispering Gallery," where the scattered rays of truth meet, and give an audible utterance to nature's laws.

How often in discourses on the powers of mind do we meet with passages like the following: "The imagination sometimes anticipates, at any existing epoch of information, a subsequent epoch, when all the facts collected up to that date justify the anticipation. They are interpreted by a law, or by a mode of force which puts them forth. They arrive at length in sufficient number, and in reations obvious enough to vindicate the previous divinings of imagination. Hardly a great man, from Pythagorus downward, can be mentioned who did not have fore-feelings of the genuine scientific direction, in number and mathematical relation, in the qualities of motion and their application to planetary phenomena, in the sphericity of the earth and stars, in the law of musical intervals, in the applications of the arc and conic sections, in the position of the earth in the solar system. Before the facts were in, the method was surmised; sometimes the law itself was hinted at and imperfectly formulated."*

Can it be that the forces of nature are radiances as well? and that the imagination here spoken of acts as the mind's eye? Is it certain that our impressional apparatus is less sensitive than the magnetized steel needle that scents the poles from invisible electric waves? In the auroral light we have indeed those same electric waves rendered visible. So, too, the invisible rays of the solar spectrum above the violet can, by the intervention of certain media, be converted into lively color. How do we know but that the most vacant space is full of instruction, if we will lend an attentive ear to its "still small voice?" Is there not, in this view, some intelligible significance in the words of the Psalmist, anticipating, perhaps, the discoveries of still future science: "Their (the heavenly bodies') string (musical tone) is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world?"

It will be observed that the kind of perception about whose possibility a question is here raised is not, strictly speaking, to be thought of as occurring *before* experience. An affirmative answer to our question would not take the side of innate ideas in the strict sense. The question is simply whether an experience much more ethereal than what we ordinarily imply by the term may not possibly result in cognitive action. If a battery of the size of a percussion cap is powerful enough to send a thrill through an ocean cable that shall give a signal at its farther end, if every disturbance in the atmosphere of the sun is marked at the earth's distance by an oscillation in the magnetic needle, may not our psychic organism be impressible in some way by extremely subtle agencies?

Here it may be objected that, though the nerves may be ever so sensitive, the signal which they give can be interpreted at first only in the light of better known facts. For instance, a person having some tender spot may feel in it an obscure and apparently causeless sensation of pain. A short time after a storm occurs. The same succession may be repeated until at length an association is established, so that whenever the peculiar pain occurs, the storm is anticipated. But even here it cannot be denied that the cause of the sensation is logically connected with the cause of the storm. Neither can it be denied that the experiential interpretation could possibly be *anticipated* by a mysterious agency called instinct; at all events, if the subject were an animal. A brood of chickens but a few days old, on hearing from their mother, herself tied, the peculiar croak which hens make on the sight of a hawk, ran instantly away from her, and took shelter under a currant bush ten feet distant. They understood the tone of warning, and took exactly the proper steps for protection against the threatened evil; although it is very doubtful if they had ever seen a hawk. Some explain such instinctive perception as being an heir-loom of ancestral experience; the chick having a hereditary dread of hawks recorded on the brain. In this view, instinct would be in a measure referable to the innate idea. Possibly ordinary sense-perception may admit of a similar reference. The eye, as an instrument for quickly constructing a distinct image from a succession of impulses, perhaps each by itself dark, may be looked upon as a net-work of ancestral experiences, automatically active in summing up the meaning of elementary data, as if it were a "calculating machine" for this purpose. The multiplication table is a sort of numerical eye for the child who has simply memorized it. As a counterpart to this view of sense-perception, we may look at the want of a sense-organ—a lack of eyes, for instance, in some of the fishes of Mammoth Cave—as evidence of a want or interruption of ancestral experience.

---

* See Jour. of Spec. Phil., Vol. VI. Theories of Mental Genesis, by John Weis·

But again our train of thought is broken in upon by the objection that, though an analogue of hereditary instinct may, perhaps, produce the phenomena of some child-prodigies, and might convert an obscure feeling into the anticipation of a storm, even on the subject's first experience of the kind, it cannot so easily be thought as a diviner of truth unknown to previous experience. As it has not been proposed to make the subject of our inquiry perfectly clear, but only to suggest a few bearings of our question, we will only observe that the development of new truth does not necessarily imply an equal evolution of new power to apprehend truth: the education of the eye of the watchmaker, acquired in the prosecution of his art, could undoubtedly be diverted to the uses of anatomic study, either in his own case, or if you please, in that of his progeny, so far as the results of experience become hereditary. So a power of mental grasp acquired by a course of metaphysical speculation, may be turned over to physical research, probably without any violent transformation in the power itself. While, then, it is the least of our desire to deny real progress of mind with every revolution of science, it does not seem necessary to pre-suppose any miraculously sudden increment of mental power, in order to conceive the possibility of an analogue of intuition as a method of perceiving what lies beyond the supposed limits of sense.

Turn we now to give a moment's thought to the question, whether the individual spirit can perceive the motions of other spirits. Nothing, it seems, could be more interesting than to know that spiritual or psychic converse is really practicable. The opening up of any new means of communication and interchange of thought is hailed with delight. The more ethereal the medium through which the new form of communication is made, the more does man esteem himself exalted by the acquisition. But as regards the possibility of a more direct method of conveying impressions from person to person than the ordinarily recognized ones, any attempt at discussion is beset with two special difficulties. In the first place, the subject has been rendered repulsive to the largest class of intelligent persons, by the extravagant vagaries of spiritualists so-called, whose pretended exhibitions of spirit-phenomena have been so gross as almost to make the mention of the theme disgusting. In the second place, there is very great difficulty in obtaining even a small amount of clear and reliable evidence of relevant facts. If one can withdraw his attention from the degrading pretensions of modern spiritualism, he may find open to view a wide field for scientific exploration, yet a field wherein objects wear a wonderfully vague and changeful aspect. If one could be persuaded to believe implicitly the stories and traditions relating to dreams, omens, miraculous occurrences, apparitions warnings, second sight, remarkable coincidences, and such like, which have been recorded, he might think the dearth of materials not so striking as has been suggested; but, probably, very few intelligent thinkers of this critical age would venture to found a science on materials of this kind. Evidence of all kinds has now to be closely scrutinized and tested, before it is admitted to serious consideration as truth. Even if one consult his own experience, and that of well known friends, he will still find it exceedingly difficult to discriminate between subjective impressions, the work of one's own brain, and impressions referable to an objective cause. In dreaming, one may sometimes be conscious enough to raise the question at the time, whether what is passing is dream or reality; but how disappointed we sometimes are, to find that what a moment ago was determined by logical tests to be real is after all but "the baseless fabric of a dream!"

But the difficulty in procuring clear evidence does not always deter men from pursuing inquiries. Amid what a maze of uncertainties has almost every science taken its start! Chemistry, which commenced with alchemy, and geology, which required centuries of time to prove that fossils were ever alive, are two competent witnesses to this point. But persistent observation gradually clears up obscurities, and gives form to what was at first shapeless; as witness the fact that science now sits in judgment on the chemistry and geology, not of the earth only, but of the sun and planets. One great fault with the more honest "spiritualists" has been that they were so eager for the possession of an *art* of spiritual communication as to be unwilling to wait for the slow growth of a science, on which alone so subtle an art could be intelligently founded. If a spirit—"whether in the body or whether out of the body"—can send out an influence that shall affect another spirit, the effect upon the other is naturally to be expected, not in the form of either sounds or sights, but in some form appropriate to that peculiar order of influence. If one in any case sees forms, or listens to words, in consequence of an influence of this kind, such visions or sounds must be considered as indirect effects—transmutations of the original impressions, or associational additions to them.

Perhaps this point cannot be better illustrated than by a narration of recent experience, with a prefatory warning to the reader, however, that the case to be narrated very likely comes actually into the psychic sphere only on the subjective side; the objective psychic element being quite possibly due to fantasy, as so often proves to be the case. The writer a few nights since, retiring late, fell shortly into a drowse; in which state he seemed to himself to be standing with his wife just outside his house, and there to hear some one distinctly call her by the family name, "Mrs. A——." He instantly became conscious enough to hear from his wife, who had been asleep before his retirement, a sort of vocal indication that she too had heard something. The question immediately arose, whether she might have dreamed the same thing simultaneously with himself. In a moment the doubt was solved by her waking, and asking if *he* had just called her; and adding that she had heard (not her surname, but) her given name, "M——," distinctly uttered, and thought he called her, and that she had answered, "what?" as she supposed. There could scarcely have been a second's difference in the time of the two hearings of the different names of the same person. Now, if it be possible that the cause of the two psychic impressions was a common one, the impressions must have been differently translated by the persons receiving them, in accordance with the respective assumed hypotheses with regard to the origin of the call; the one thinking it to be the address of a comparative stranger to his wife, and shaping the name accordingly; and the other imagining it to be the familiar voice of her husband.

The occurrence would probably be set down by most as an "accidental coincidence;" which, possibly, may be all the interpretation required. It might, indeed, have been that some sound was heard by the two persons, which was resolved into words by each; still the peculiarity remains that both heard the same one addressed, and conceived the address to come from a personal source. Of course, no one would think of attaching any great amount of meaning to such an occurrence. But, if every phenomenon means something, it may not be amiss to take cognizance of the little things of experience. An ardent admirer of the atomic theory would doubtless give more to see an *atom* than a mountain.

The atom is his *unit* of material being, in the conception of which he sees the whole fabric. The more elementary the study of psychic science can be made, the more reliable will be its results. In this view of the value of little things, it may be worth while to notice in reference to the question, whether psychic power can send out radiance, that animals certainly do radiate heat, and that the fire-fly can, apparently at will, transform vital energy into light; or at all events, can *radiate* light. We know, too, that the electric eel can give shocks of great force, as well as generate electric sparks; and that this ability is not absolutely peculiar to this kind of animal, is proved by the fact of occasionally a human person's being found possessed of the same sort of power.

Now, considering that these radiant and communicable forces, known to be possessed by animals, are so kindred with the sun's own rays, is it a very wild generalization to infer that all animate beings are radiant beings? Of course, the supposition that there may be grades of radiance characteristic of each animate order, up to the most rational, would be a hypothesis wholly without proof. But what many may think of sooner than of questioning the hypothesis would be the question: Of what use can such an infinitesimal emission of energy as we can suppose in the case, be as an agent of communication? As well might we think of reading by the light of a star of the seventh magnitude, or of warming ourselves by moonlight, as to think to get wisdom or pleasure from the faint emanations from human thought or emotion!

Here, once more, Nature comes to furnish some relief to the argument on the other side, by offering examples of agencies extremely weak in some respects, but much stronger as measured by other aspects. Tyndall says, "No doubt every luminous ray is also a heat-ray; but the light-giving power is not even an approximate measure of the calorific energy of a beam." Now, the moon-beams, after having their *invisible* heat-rays absorbed by the atmosphere, sometimes reach us with illuminating power enough almost to turn night into day; and yet the best experimenters have found extreme difficulty in detecting signs of heat in them. The reason assigned for the difference of effects is that the eye is sensitive to an exceedingly minute influence of light. The adaptation of spiritual or psychic *influence* to psychic *susceptibility* may be, for aught we know to the contrary, still finer.

We will omit any special consideration of possible influence from disembodied spirits, or from the great Sun of spiritual being—closing with those memorable words of Hamlet:

> "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
> Than are dreamt of in your philosophy."

ART. VIII—FAITH AND ITS OBJECTS.

IF we start with the general idea of faith as trust or belief, trusting in or believing in, and then regard it as an activity especially of man's spiritual nature, we shall find that it grows out of his need of God. He is made for God, and cannot rest until he rests in God. This idea of faith is of course very general, and if we aimed at a concise definition we would need to distinguish the need here referred to from other necessities of our nature, as for instance, that of our knowing faculties. To know God here also is one of the deepest necessities of our nature, and the knowledge of God lies at the foundation of all other knowledge. We speak of faith, however, as starting in a want of the spirit, and as referring to the apprehension of the God by our moral nature.

This want of our moral nature in its broadest sense is our sense of dependence. Man is dependent on God, and therefore he needs God. His life is only relative; it has no absolutely independent existence, but must draw its constant supply from God. Hence he must look to God in the way of trust or confidence, much as the child looks to its parent.

This trust or confidence, however, passes into a more positive state when it becomes a reaching out after and a real apprehension of God as He is pleased to come to man in meeting his spiritual need. In this sense it becomes an activity of the spirit in relation to God, like the activity of the senses in relation to the material world, or like the intellect in appropriating truth. As the natural world in a certain sense enters our being through the senses, so that what we see and taste becomes a part of ourselves; or as we appropriate intellectual truth through our thinking faculty, and make it our own, a part of ourselves; so faith really appropriates what our spiritual nature needs from God.

In this most general sense of faith there is implied for its activity a movement of God towards man. Just as the natural world must confront man with proper conditions before he can see, or taste, or hear, and just as truth must be brought to challenge the intellect, and by its presence stir up the activity of thought, so must God come to man, and by His presence enkindle the activity of faith. This implies already in the original order of things a revelation. The approach of God to man through revelation is primary, man's apprehension of Him by faith is a responsive activity. Without such approach of the divine, the human might have a sense of want, but it would perish in its want.

Hence in His original creation in Paradise God revealed Himself to man, and made known to him His law and grace; His law in the command requiring obedience, and His grace in the promise of life. The union and communion here offered, it is proper to observe, could not have been consummated by faith alone on the part of man. This would have been only the necessary condition on the human side. The union would have been effected rather by God's coming into communion with man in the way of spiritual life, the inflow of truth and grace from the absolute fountain of life.

In the trial man failed by unbelief. He believed and trusted in the arch-deceiver rather than God, and so he fell, fell away from God, and thus lost the normal bond of union with Him. This separation from God left him a prey to the ungodly and infernal powers of spiritual darkness, and as a consequence his whole nature came to be depraved.

In providing redemption for man, God comes to him a second time to open up the fountains of love, of truth and grace, in order that they may flow into his being and that he may live and not die. This approach on the part of God requires that He should break through the barriers of sin, death and hell. Sin must be removed, the law vindicated, and death overcome, before God could again confront man, and bid him to look and live. Hence the incarnation, the life, and death, and resurrection of Christ. And that the communion might begin in the sphere of the spirit, where the fall began, the presence of God in redemption is now made to confront man in the Holy Spirit. Life is offered to him a second time, and he is called upon to believe, and in believing to open his spirit to the inflow of grace from above.

But although all the barriers that stood in the way of God's approach to man are now removed, so that Christ represents Himself as really standing at the door and knocking, in order to find entrance into man, yet there is still on man's side the hindrance of sin and unbelief, the one the cause of the other. How can God dwell with sinful man? God is holy, and His presence where sin abounds brings with it only judgment and condemnation. But the divine presence now, through the Spirit, itself carries with it the pardon of sin and its antidote. It is the presence of redemptive life, and man is challenged to believe in God's love to him, notwithstanding his sin. The very act of believing then so far as man is concerned opens the way for the divine presence in its redemptive power.

At this point the question in regard to justification by faith presents itself. Just as long as the sinner feels himself guilty before God and his sin unpardoned, he resists God's approach because he knows that it carries with it for him condemnation. He is challenged to believe that God is ready to regard him as righteous, free from guilt and sin, if he believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, with a full surrender of himself to Him. And yet such an act of faith implies that he *is* in some sense delivered from the guilt of sin. We can only say in reference to this point, that here the divine and human factors come together in the work of salvation in a way that is a mystery. The case is analogous to that of the man with a withered hand, when Christ commanded him to stretch it forth. He had no power of his own to do so, and yet faith required him to obey. The command itself conveyed the ability through his faith.

What, now, is the true object of faith in the justification of the sinner? What is he to believe? Is it the proposition that Christ has made full satisfaction for all his sins, and that there is for him now full and free pardon? That certainly is involved, but that is not the object of his faith in the proper sense. He believes, properly speaking, not in a proposition, but in Christ who confronts him with His redemptive work, carrying in His own person pardon for sin and grace to renew and sanctify him. And the gift received by faith is, not merely the pardon of sin, but Christ as his Saviour, carrying into his soul the actual deliverance from the fetters of sin, and in this the removal of guilt.

This is the reason he is, and must be, justified by faith and not by the works of the law. Not because a full and perfect conformity to the law would not justify him, were that possible, for Christ Himself said to a certain one " this do" (*i. e.*, obey the law by loving the Lord, etc., and thy neighbor as thyself) "and thou shalt live." But no one can obey the law perfectly in this spirit of love without receiving Christ, who is the end of the law to all that believe. And he can receive Christ only by faith, because faith here is just such receptivity on the part of the spirit as is necessary for His entrance into the soul.

Would it not follow from this that it is only by receiving Christ that man becomes righteous, and that his justification is therefore predicated of an infused righteousness, according to the Roman theory? We answer, no, because his very act of faith puts him in such right relation to God objectively as that God can now look upon him as reconciled to Him even before he has become subjectively perfectly righteous. This carries, with it, indeed, the guarantee that in Christ he shall be freed actually from all sin in his sanctification and glorification. But the Roman theory reverses the order here. Acceptance with God is measured by the degree of sanctification attained, and thus justification and sanctification are identified. Moreover, the Roman theory left the fact of being in grace and accepted of God in uncertainty. This is sometimes overlooked in the present controversy with Rome, which is made to turn on the certainty of the external rule of faith or dogmatic teaching. The infallibility of the pope is held up against the various and varying confessions of Protestantism, and a certitude is claimed for the former which the latter does not possess. In the time of the Reformation the question of certitude turned on a different point, viz.: subjective certitude, the certitude which faith brings to the believer.

It may indeed be said that this latter, subjective certitude, must depend on a certainty in regard to the teaching of the Church. Protestantism itself has, at times, unwittingly fallen into this same

Roman error when it supposed itself to be farthest from Rome; as in the 17th century, its scholastic period, when it placed the certainty in regard to the inspiration of Scripture and belief in certain passages of Scripture in the place of the testimonium spiritus sancti, as held in the time of the Reformation. And large sections of Protestantism still manifest a tendency to rest here, when they place belief in the inspiration of Scripture as the first article in a summary of the Christian faith.

The question here becomes perplexing, for we seem to be in a vicious circle from which there is no escape. But the right relation of the two Reformation principles helps us to solve the difficulty. Faith here, we may say emphatically, must have its rights. Christ and the everlasting verities of our holy religion must have a self-authenticating power which is on an equality, to say the least, with any external testimony. Nay, with the Reformers, we give it chief place, without by any means leaving out of view the necessity of the Scripture as the rule of faith.

We could show, we think, that such was the case when our Saviour challenged the faith of His disciples in His person, and we could show that the same was the case in the Apostles' preaching. Neither the inspiration of the Scriptures, nor the infallibility of the Church, demonstrated to the mind, formed the foundation for the certitude of faith in Christ.

There are two points here that seem to call for further elucidation First, in regard to the object of faith in justification. The Reformers made this to consist in the forgiveness of sins, and the object of faith was for them the promise of pardon through Christ. When *Osiander* brought out the idea that the whole Christ is the object of faith, and that His righteousness is formed in us, he was opposed, and even Melanchthon urged against him that in his theory the forgiveness of sins was not made sufficiently special. But while the Reformers did thus make prominent this point, they did not separate it from the reception of Christ. The Christological principle does not contradict their position, but it complements it. The Christological is broader than the soteriological.

The other point pertains to the question of certitude in regard to salvation, or the forgiveness of sin, as it was often stated. God's word gives us assurance of this on the condition of faith; then our faith itself gives assurance of our justification and the truth of the word at the same time. We must not separate Christ, as He is present by the Holy Spirit, from His word—the one is in the other. No external word, in itself, can authenticate Christ to us, for He is greater than the word. But the word is Christ's word, and when He comes He is recognized as the author of it. So the Old Testament word pointed to Christ, and was evidence of His mission and claim when He came. And He pointed the Jews to this testimony, "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?" And He convicted them of error and unbelief by quoting from the Old Testament against them. But this did not secure their faith in Him. Only those who were of the truth heard His words, and they recognized in His words the same that spake unto them in the Old Testament word.

It may be said that the Mohammedan and the Buddhist, and all false religionists, claim also this subjective certitude. That is true, and it is true also that they claim to rest on an infallible revelation; so that the point made by introducing them holds quite as forcibly against the certitude that is based on external infallible teaching, as upon that which rests on a subjective apprehension of the truth. Nay, the argument, that because there is what is regarded as an assurance of faith in false religions, therefore there can be no validity in the assurance of faith in the true religion, proves too much. For the same argument would prove that there can be no certainty anywhere; for there is no true science but has error arrayed against it, and that by those who claim sincerity and believe their error. No external word from God asserting the efficacy of prayer could convince Tyndall that there is such efficacy in prayer, because he would ask that that word should be authenticated in his mind by its agreement with the truth before he would believe it is God's word; for, he would say, God cannot contradict Himself. But God in His natural creation confines all events to the operation of natural laws. How then can He ask us to believe a divine word which is in conflict with His word in nature or science? So we come to the point where our Saviour leaves it. "He that is of God, heareth God's words." It is only to faith, which grounds itself in a right relation to the truth on the part of the spirit, that saving truth can authenticate itself; and a mere historical faith, or a conviction wrought by external testimony, cannot authenticate saving faith, for that would make the less authenticate the greater. The two evidently go together. The one does not prove the other, but both unite as one and the same divine word.

This does not mean that Christianity cannot maintain its truth against unbelieving science. It can answer every objection, and show that science does not contradict revelation. But it cannot, by such demonstration to natural reason, convert unbelieving science to saving faith. Christ Himself did not attempt to convert men in that way. "If ye were of the truth, ye would hear my words."

This seems to be a digression from the point we were considering in regard to justification, the ground of which we found to be, according to Protestant teaching, not infused righteousness, *justitia inhærens*, but imputed righteousness, *justitia putitiva*, in the true sense. We hold up here again the case of the man with a withered hand. He believed, and in believing received power. If he had waited until he had a sense of power given him before he believed, he would not have stretched forth his hand at all. So now the challenge of Christ through the spirit awakens the slumbering energies of the soul, and requires the sinner to believe that he is accepted of God for the sake of Christ's merits, as a condition for his subjective sanctification. This must be the starting point, without which any effort to attain to righteousness in any other way must prove futile, for whatever is not of faith is sin.

But our digression has brought out what we wish to make prominent in the treatment of our subject, viz., that just as it is not a proposition which is the object of faith in justification, so also neither the Bible nor the Church is the primary object of faith, but the Lord Jesus Christ.

If it be true that man's deepest spiritual want is God, fellowship and communion with Him, as we assumed in the beginning of this article, and Christ is God revealed to us for our salvation, then Christ, immediately and directly, is the true object of faith. Faith apprehends Him as bringing life, spiritual life, of which He is the source. Just as really as the disciples trusted in Him, and by faith received His present help when He was on the earth, and just as really as they received Him as a present Saviour through the baptism of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and realized that His presence with them was closer, and His life was more really in them than when He was with them in the flesh, so He is in like manner the immediate object of the believer's faith now. To these assertions there is a general assent among Christians. But in order not to misunderstand them, we need to consider the relation of the means of grace to Christ and to faith; otherwise we might fall into the error of the fanatics of the Reformation, nay of the mystics of every age, who proclaim an unmediated Christ, and deny the means of grace; or of those who retain the use of these means, and yet, in regard to some of them at least, turn them into empty signs, and thus render them nugatory, or else find in them a magical power.

Against the error of the first we must assert the historical character of Christianity. Christ established a kingdom or economy of grace, in which, since His departure from the earth, in His glorification He continues to dwell through the Holy Spirit. Hence the Church is called His body, and His promise is, "Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." As the soul is present in the human body, filling it at all points with life, so Christ is present in His mystical body, the Church, and there continually reveals the power of His glorified life. The Church does not stand between the believer and Christ, as though he may come to the one first, and then to the other. The graft that is inserted in the tree is placed, not only in union with the limbs and trunk, but at the same time with the life that is in these, and which is present equally and directly in every portion.

What is true of the Church in general, is true of the means of grace appointed in the Church, the Word and the Sacraments. We are concerned here first with the relation of the means of grace to Christ, and then afterwards with the relation of faith to the means of grace. It has been asserted by some that faith is the medium of communication between Christ and the believer; that what the waves of the air are to that which sets them in motion, producing sound, and what the wave of ether is to the object setting it in motion producing light as effect, such a medium is faith, by which Christ conveys Himself and His salvation to the soul. This analogy, besides being very poor because taken from inorganic nature, where analogies are seldom found in the Scriptures, is at fault because it leaves out of view the Holy Spirit and the means of grace.

How is Christ present as He challenges faith on the part of men? Evidently through the Word of God. Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. The preached Word is the form in which Christ continues His ministry on earth, calling men to repent and believe on Him.

Christ through the Holy Spirit is in the word, for the end and purpose for which the word is given. This union of Christ with the word is not effected by faith, although unbelief may cause that the one is not heard with the other. The word is not a mere record and statement for the intellect, but it is a living word, as though Christ still speaks to men calling them to Himself. The susceptible spirit hears his voice, and recognizes it as the voice of the Good Shepherd.

So also Christ is in the sacraments as forms or elements of the whole Gospel. The offer of salvation is made through the word, the sign and seal is presented in the sacraments. There is grace in the sacraments, according to their objective constitution, independent of the faith of man, but the grace is only for him who believes. It may be difficult to present the specific character of the grace in the sacraments as compared with the grace in the word. We can only reach this by inquiring what the Scriptures make known to us in regard to them. In holy baptism there is present the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the washing away of sin by the blood of Christ; in the Lord's Supper there are the body and blood of Christ for spiritual nourishment. Without attempting to explain more particularly the difference, we may say that it is Christ who is present in sacrament and word. Through the Holy Ghost, who takes of the things that are Christ's and makes them ours, these, the word and the sacraments, are the form or mode in which Christ Himself confronts us.

From this we can without great difficulty ascertain the relation of faith to the word and sacrament. In these means of grace Christ touches us, so to speak, makes His salvation reach us and elect us. Faith responds to the approach of Christ in and through these, and fixes itself on Him who is their life and substance. "It is not faith that makes the sacrament, but this is rather there as the object of faith, which it must sooner or later lay hold of." We may distingush, according to Luther, between the *essence* of baptism and its *power*, between its *validity* and its *beneficial effect.* He is speaking here of infant baptism. Hence in the Heidelberg catechism the baptized child is required to answer, "I am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour, Jesus Christ, who has purchased me with His precious blood," etc., etc. All that is here spoken of as belonging to the child, belongs to it by baptism; yet it is evident that this inheritance can become real possession in the way of subjective experience only by faith.

The sacramental is always God's approach to us. Hence we cannot properly place faith in antithesis to the sacraments. We cannot properly say, "the believer receives the grace of God by faith, and not through the sacraments." He receives it *through* the sacraments, as appointed means, *by* faith.

Those who regard the sacraments as empty signs, and yet continue to observe them, are formalists in the bad sense, because they cling only to the form and reject the substance. This class observe the sacraments merely because God has commanded them to be observed. Baptism has nothing in it, but God has commanded us to be baptized, and it is our duty to obey. Or, in some cases, the benefit of baptism is regarded as magical. The mind is naturally inclined to associate something with such observances, and if it knows not the true it will substitute the false.

There is a strong tendency in certain sections of the Church to put doctrinal propositions in the place of Christ as the object of faith. To believe in the proposition that Christ has made atonement for sin, that God is willing therefore to pardon, and then to take home to himself this truth, this is looked upon as the course faith should take. Not a doctrinal proposition, but Christ is the true object of saving faith.

Then there is a tendency sometimes to divide Christ. His death on the cross is set up as the only fact that faith need embrace. All else is only subsidiary to this. He became incarnate only in order that it might be possible for Him to die on the cross. He kept the law because it was His nature to do so. He arose from the dead because His work of making propitiation by dying was over, and He ascended because He had nothing further to do here on earth. Perhaps there is a tinge of caricature in this, but we make it in order to expose the error. Not the death of Christ, but Christ Himself is the true object of faith. First Christ, and then His work performed for our salvation, is the right order here. His work in every portion and element of it derives all its significance and value from His divine-human person. He is Emmanuel, God with us, and upon Him the believer rests his faith, and finds eternal peace and rest. T. G. A.

THE UNION MOVEMENT.

LETTER FROM DR. PELTZ.

To the Editors of the Mercersburg Review:—The article in the Review for April last, on "The late union movement of the two Reformed Churches," seems to oblige me to make a brief declaration, which you will please publish in the next number of the Review.

The excellent author makes the mistake of attributing motives to the Committee of the Reformed Church in America, which he would not have made had he known how thoroughly he has been led astray in his inferences.

Without an opportunity of consulting with my colleagues of that committee, I feel assured that I speak their convictions of what is just and fair, when I protest against anything of the kind being put on record as history in this case, *except the paper adopted by both committees.* (*a*)

That paper presents some of the inducements in favor of union, and some of the insuperable difficulties still powerful to prevent union. The committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, feeling the full force of these obstacles, regards union, at present, as impossible. Such is the honest conviction of every one of our committee present at the meeting in Philadelphia. We expect that our purposes and judgment will be admitted to be honest and fraternal.

In regard to the skeleton of a plan of union suggested by our brethren of the Reformed Church in the United States, it should be said that our committee sees nothing in it that could deserve the name of *"organic union."* No such scheme would be entertained for a moment in our Church, because there is no real union in it. If our committee seemed unable to see its advantages, the fact must be explained by the conviction that it has no advantages.

When the Dutch Church consults, in regard to union with a sister Church, she means something a thousand times closer and more affectionate than the plan blocked out by the esteemed writer of the article in the REVIEW. Unless we get much more than this, we would have less than nothing. (*b*)

Very pleasant and instructive were our conferences with the German Church. We have learned where our brethren stand. We do not feel that we are of one mind sufficiently to warrant any continued effort after organic union. This is only because we feel that union implies and requires more *unity* in creed and polity than the word suggests to some of our brethren of the other committee.

It is to be regretted that the historical article under consideration shows a disposition to question the good faith of the Reformed Church in America and of her Committee. But the official declaration of the Synods of the Reformed Church in the United States will be the proper sources of information upon these points. It has been my happy lot to enjoy large opportunities for conference with those Synods in an official capacity, and I cannot but believe that the friendly and affectionate interest of my own Church is reciprocated by those with whom I have been brought in contact. (*c*)

Whilst considering it due to truth to express this general demurrer to some declarations and insinuations in the paper alluded to, it is pleasant to express cordial appreciation of many declarations full of Christian confidence, sympathy and affection, uttered by the brethren of the Reformed Church in the United States. The unwelcome duty of correcting a wrong impression does not interfere with the enjoyment of pleasant recollections connected with all our intercourse with that Church and its representatives.

Yours very cordially,

PH. PELTZ.

New Paltz, N. Y., Sept. 17, 1875.

(*a*) The writer is correct here in one sense. What was adopted by the committees, and that only, can be regarded as the proceedings of the committees. But a history of the movement started by the Reformed Church in America, looking to a union with the Reformed Church in the United States, certainly includes more than the final paper adopted. The origin of the movement, and the action of the two General Synods, and the debates or speeches, these certainly form parts of the history of the movement. The writer in the REVIEW may not have succeeded in making it complete and entirely impartial; but as he prepared his article from notes taken at the time, we may suppose it is correct. At any rate the writer of the above declaration and protest does not point out anything in the article that is not correct. We have only his assertion that it does injustice to the motives of the brethren from the Reformed (Dutch) Church. Where in the article, or how, we are not informed.

(*b*) We have nothing to say in regard to the merits of the skeleton of a plan of union, drawn up and presented by the writer of the article in the Review. It may have been entirely inadequate for what was desired in the way of union. But when Dr. Peltz urges that it presented no plan for *organic union*, and that the Dutch Church wants something a thousand times closer and more affectionate than this plan proposed, he forgets, perhaps, that at that time his Church was negotiating with the Presbyterian Church South for a union which was *not* organic, and less close and affectionate than that contemplated in the plan offered at Philadelphia. Organic union is generally regarded as impossible at this time between the different denominations. Some think it undesirable. But if we cannot have that, may we not have something less, at least, to begin with ?

(*c*) We acknowledge that the facts as brought out in the article in this Review, do not place the Reformed Dutch Church in the most pleasant attitude in reference to this union movement. She first proposed a union. The plan seemed to be at first to unite one of our Classes to their body. Then it extended so as to include one of our District Synods. It was said that all this grew out of a misunderstanding in regard to our government. When this mistake was corrected, the overture came to our General Synod, to which it ought to have been made at first. Now, when all things were ready to proceed, the committee from the Dutch Church suddenly came to a halt. *They had nothing to propose*—absolutely nothing. Our committee seemed to feel that after all that had gone before, some plan of union ought at least to be discussed, and accordingly they proposed one. It might be inadequate, but it would at least open the subject for discussion, and show that we were willing to respond to the cordial overture of the Dutch Church.

We do not remember that the author of the article reflected at all on the motives of the brethren from the Dutch Church. The facts may have seemed to produce the impression that they, after all, did not really desire a union with the German Church. We do not think that such was the case. We think the Dutch Reformed Church only made a mistake in initiating a movement for union before the time, and when they saw this they were ready to drop it. But the burden rests upon them. We did not interpose objections to union, but they did. It is best that it should be so. They will feel all the more free to act hereafter, when the right time comes for a real and lasting union.

We cordially reciprocate the writer's kind regards for the German Church. We are sure that none but the kindest feelings are entertained by our Synods and people towards the Church which was sister to us in our early history in this country. If the article in the Review made any other impression, we regret it. [Ed. Review.]

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Statement of Reasons for Embracing the Doctrines and Disclosures of Emanuel Swedenborg. By the Rev. George Bush, Late Professor of Hebrew in the New York University, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author. New York: Published by E. Hazzard Swinney, No. 20 Cooper Union, 1875.

A very interesting pamphlet of 120 pages. Prof. George Bush was well known as an eminent Biblical scholar, and his life is here sketched with vividness and skill by an admiring friend. It is the life of a conscientious man, an independent thinker and a laborious scholar. We admire his originality and independence. It is a misfortune certainly to be slavishly bound to theological ruts, as though theological science were inspired and we were bound to follow it as we follow the Bible itself. A certain independency belongs also to every man in regard to Church confessions and Church polity. But when we come to those things which belong to the creed and dogmas of the Church which have been believed and held through the ages, our fancied independence may become mere arbitrary opinion, and real bondage instead of freedom.

We are not told in this memoir what it was in the Presbyterian faith that Prof. Bush first rejected, whilst a Presbyterian minister, except his refusal to accept the Presbyterian polity as of divine appointment. Such a refusal certainly is no great offense. It seems, however, that he became dissatisfied with the whole Protestant conception of the Church, and especially with the idea of a ministry or priesthood. Then came his change of views on the subject of the resurrection, and the millennium, which, he believed, is passed, and the common view of the second coming of Christ and the end of the world. Before he had any acquaintance with Swedenborg's views, he had by independent investigation come to hold the same view of the resurrection, which, he held, takes place at death. When he discovered this coincidence he commenced the study of Swedenborg's revelations, and ended in becoming a convert to that system. In this pamphlet he gives his reasons for his conversion and endorsement of Swedenborgianism.

The pamphlet is worthy of high respect as emanating from a fine Biblical scholar, and as written with his acknowledged ability and fairness. At the same time it presents in a brief compass the leading views of Swedenborg. Some of these views we propose briefly to notice.

Prof. Bush presents first his reasons for accepting Swedenborg's claim in regard to his knowledge of the spiritual world, which are based mainly on the fact that his disclosures commend themselves to our judgment and faith. They not only commend themselves as truthful, but are "of such a nature as to transcend the utmost grasp of the unassisted human faculties."

There is much in these disclosures that must commend them to every thinking person, but what we can accept is just what, we believe, is held by such thinking persons in the Christian Church, apart from any supernatural revelation from Swedenborg. We think he misrepresents the common view of thoughtful Christians when he speaks of "the erroneous belief that man lives after death as a mere soul or mind, and that, not under the form of a man, but under the form of a breath or respiration, or a bubble of air, as arising from man's not knowing that the mind constitutes the interior form of the whole body." There is no doubt a wide-spread conception of the spiritual world as a mere abstraction; but those who obtain their views from the Word of God have no such thought. We believe that a man's *state* in the other world is what *he* is; that is, good or bad, according as he is such. We believe, moreover, that the other world has a sphere of existence,—that it is a world, but whether that sphere is in such correspondence to the natural world, that it has mountains and valleys, houses and animals just as here, except that they are spiritual, this we do not claim to know, because it has not been revealed. The whole argument, that the scenery of the spiritual world is a *projection* by spiritual beings, that our thoughts and fancies make realities, because whatever we think as spiritual beings are entities, reminds us of Fichte's theory of the natural world, that it is only a limitation of the *ego*, or of Kant's subjectivism. This, to our thinking, make that real world too much of an airy phantom, because it is purely subjective. As we believe in the objective entities of the natural world around us, even though they are in a sense merely phenomenal. so we like to think of realities in the order of the spiritual world as objective entities. In regard to this point, however, we allow freedom to every one to picture the other world according to his own best thoughts, in reference to all things not revealed in the Word of God.

But so far as Swedenborg's claim is concerned, that he was permitted to enter that world before death, and to make revelations concerning it beyond what is revealed through Chirst, we must set it aside as conflicting with the one revelation made by Christ. His revelation is final and conclusive. He has told us all we ought to know of that world, and His teachings on this subject are given in that book which is closed also, and to which no one may add anything. "If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe through one arose from the dead." The rich man in Hades thought otherwise, but Abraham corrected him. We pretend not to be able to explain or account for Swedenborg's fancies on this point, but we must say of his claims here, that they fall under the condemnation of the Apostle: though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel (revelation), it must be rejected.

What Swedenborg says of angels, that they are human spirits, from our own or some other earth, may or may not be true. We do not think that it accords with what the Bible teaches on this subject; but as the subject is mysterious, and different views prevail among interpreters of the Bible, we do not see that it is of any great importance one way or the other. Some persons, we know, hold the view who have no sympathy with Swedenborg's revelations.

The reasons given by Prof. Bush for accepting Swedenborg's view of the atonement have force only as against a perverted representation of the theory of the Protestant Church. The doctrine of justification by faith, as Prof. Bush had been taught it, and of the atonement according to the juridical theory, would naturally give way before Swedenborg's doctrine. But let the atonement as held by the Protestant Church be properly represented, and we have all that is good in Swedenborgianism, without its fatal errors. Here, we believe, lies one of the greatest dangers in Swedenborg's system, and it is the more dangerous because it contains so much truth.

It denies the whole idea of making satisfaction for man's sin and guilt *in any sense.* Christ, in making atonement for our sins, acted only in the character of God, and not also of man. True, He was in the form of man, but He did not in any sense take the place of man in relation to God. He took this place only in relation to the hells, the infernal world. He made no satisfaction to the law which man had broken, and there is no such thing now as justification by faith.

And this brings us to another point closely connected with this, viz: Swedenborg's view of the Trinity and the Person of Christ. He denies a trinity of persons in the Godhead, and hence must deny also the true mediation of Christ. The error here consists not merely in rejecting the church's definition of three persons. The word person as used to set forth the *hypostases* in the Godhead, is objectionable, we know, to many who hold firmly to the doctrine of the Trinity, and Prof. Bush quotes some authorities to show this. But Swedenborg sets aside the fact of the Trinity, as well as the doctrine and definition. He has a kind of trinity in the Godhead, that is a trinity in Christ, who is the only person in the

Godhead, but not in any sense in which the Christian Church of all ages, *ubique, semper, et ab omnibus*, has held it. This error, we believe, nullifies the real and true mediation of Christ, and overthrows the fact of the atonement. For, denying the Trinity, he must also deny the accepted faith of the Church in regard to the incarnation and the constitution of the person of Christ. Christ is not the God-man, that is true God and true man in one person. "For if He were a man precisely in the sense in which we are men—*having a human soul as well as a human body*—then there is no conceivable ground on which He could justly be denominated God, except by the *external adjunction* of the divine to the human nature. . . . . In other words, must He not have had a divine spirit or soul enveloped in a human body? . . . ." Swedenborg therefore speaks of the incarnation as that "by which Jehovah *sent Himself* into the world, and if the above view be correct, this is in fact implied in its being said that the Father *sent the Son* into the world."

We would say just the opposite. The idea of God joining Himself merely to a human *body* would be an external adjunction; it would not be an incarnation, for in that case God would join Himself to only a portion of man, and that portion which is most external, that portion which is not the true essence of man. Here we reach the most fatal error of Swedenborg—the denial of the incarnation. What is a human body without a human soul? How can we separate between the two? We might perhaps think of a human soul without a human body, but a body without a soul is a corpse.

And this comes from Swedenborg's doctrine of *correspondences*, which is essentially dualistic. There is no organic union between soul and body, but only a union of correspondence. In the same way there is no organic union between the natural and the supernatural, any more than there is between substance and shadow, and so Christ does not really bind the whole creation, natural and supernatural in one—He is no true Mediator. And how, in this view, could He be a High Priest who could be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, if He did not suffer in a human soul as well as a human body? And how could He say "my *soul* is exceeding sorrowful!" (my divinity is exceeding sorrowful!) "even unto death." And how could He say: "Into Thy hands I commend my Spirit?" Was it His divinity which He commended to God in His dying hour?

In this connection we do not perhaps travel out of the record to notice Swedenborg's view of the Mahometan heaven. In treating of the subject of polygamy both among the Mahometans and Jews, he asserts that it is not sinful for them, because the true Church was not with them. Indeed his views on this whole subject are very liberal, so much so as to allow a man, under certain circumstances, to keep a concubine in addition to a wife. He says: "The Mahometans also have their heaven; for all in the universe, who acknowledge a God, and from a religious notion shun evils as sins against Him, are saved." They have a superior and an inferior heaven. Those in the inferior heaven live with several wives and concubines as in the world; but those who renounce concubines and live with one wife, are elevated into the superior Mahometan heaven. Swedenborg saw the Mahometan heaven on one occasion, but what he says of it need not be repeated here, for it would not be to edification.

We refer to this point to show that he does not hold the Scriptural conception of the mediation of Christ. Salvation, complete salvation, with him consists in receiving love and truth from the Lord; but those who do not know Christ, or who will not accept Him, as the Mohametans, nevertheless have a heaven also prepared for them, and receive life from the Lord in a way different from that in which Christians receive it. And this because Christ is the absolute and only Lord, the only person in the Godhead, and therefore He gives life to men in all religions, where there is sincere obedience to the truth. What will become of the heathen and false religionists, those among them who try to live virtuous lives, we need not say; but our Scriptures teach us that there is no other name given under heaven among men whereby they can be saved but the name of Christ.

Swedenborg's doctrine of the resurrection, rather his denial of a general resurrection and judgment at the last day, contradicts, as we think; the teaching of the Bible also. The second coming of Christ, he says, has already taken place. It occurred in the eighteenth century, and he was commissioned to preach that the New Jerusalem has already descended out of heaven. Dark and dreary would this leave the future for the world. Christ came, and no one knew it but Swedenborg; whereas the Scripture declares that every eye shall see Him. There was no perceptible change in the world's history, no help for a suffering Church, no deliverance for waiting saints, no new heavens and new earth, no judgment in a separation of the good and the bad, and yet the glorious second coming has taken place. There is nothing further for the Church to hope and pray for. For all we know, history is to go on without a conclusion. This, we say, makes the future dark and dreary indeed.

But, no, it does not make it so; for Swedenborg made no new revelation. It was his notion, his belief; but his notion and belief do not make things to be as he conceived them to be, any more than the fancies of a dream are objective realities. But our space compels us to stop.

We have read this pamphlet with interest, as bringing into a small compass the system of Swedenborg by a Swedenborgian, and one who is confessed to have been one of its most able expounders and defenders. His representation of it is sent forth by the Swedenborgian Society as correct and able. What is good and true in it, and there is certainly much that is good and true there, we have in the old faith of the Church, without what we regard as its fatal errors.

TEXT-BOOK OF CHURCH HISTORY. By Dr. John Henry Kurtz, Professor of Theology in the University of Dorpat: Author of "A Manual of Sacred History," "The Bible and Astronomy," etc., etc. Two Volumes in One, Revised, with Corrections and Additions from the Seventh German Edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., No. 710 Arch Street. 1875.

This valuable text-book, published in this country in two volumes in English, in 1860, is now re-published in one volume. Of its merits it is hardly necessary to speak, for they have been acknowledged wherever it has been used. It has its defects; but as a help to the student of Church history, its merits far outweigh them. There is not much attention paid to epochs, but to some extent they are regarded. We have recommended it as one among other text-books to be placed in the hands of students, to be consulted in connection with lectures.

We see that the translator has corrected the barbarous mistake on page 261, 2d vol., where the word "shoulderminology" occurs. It is now printed "scholastic terminology." An Addenda is published at the close of the work which contains some valuable material, and brings the history, at certain points, down to the present time. We think it would have been well to have given a chapter here on American Church History, as the author gives very little space to this subject in the body of the work, besides making a number of mistakes. But we cannot do all things; and we take the work as it now appears, and commend it to the general reader, and especially to students of theology. Dr. Bomberger deserves the thanks of the theological public for the service he has rendered in correcting and improving the translation.

THE DIVINE-HUMAN ELEMENTS IN THE CHURCH AND MINISTRY. A sermon; preached at the Trinity ordination, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., May 26, 1875. By the Rev. Samuel H. Giesy, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Norwich, Conn.

We have read this sermon with pleasure. The theme which it treats is a familiar one in the theology of our Reformed Church.

It confines itself to the general theme without introducing special denominational views. With the exception of one sentence on page 21, "They held from Christ, and by His authority from them, deacons, priests, and Bishops, in the ascending order," it does not indicate that it was preached in an Episcopal Seminary. What it says on the subject of the Church and the Christian ministry, that it is divine-human, divine as to its origin, authority and powers,—human as to the subjects, which consist of fallible and imperfect men,—must be conceded by all who believe in the Holy Catholic Church according to the Apostles' Creed.

We think the author of the sermon fails at one point to bring out the character of the ministry as an organic function in the Church, as well as an organ of Christ. He says: "In its origin the Holy Ministry is Divine. This it is, not because it stands in the Church, which is itself Divine. It does, both in point of time and fact, take precedence. The Apostolic Commission went before the Pentecostal creation. The ministry was before, and in order to the Church in its aggressive mission. It was not the product of the Church in any sense."

There is here, as well as running through the whole sermon, a sundering of what the author calls the Church and the ministry, which we think involves an error, and is not warranted by the Scriptures. The ministry is a *part* of the Church, an organic function in and of the Church, while at the same time it receives its commission and authority from Christ and not from men. It is true the Apostolic Commission went before the Pentecostal creation. But so did also the call of disciples who were not among the twelve. The one hundred and twenty on the day of Pentecost were met together as one body, and they received the baptism of the Holy Ghost simultaneously; that is, the twelve and the rest were baptized together by Christ from above. In point of fact the Church was born on the day of Pentecost, as including ministry and laity. Neither went before the other. The twelve did not receive the Spirit first, and then baptize the rest, but both were baptized together.

Now this does not show that the ministry is not ordained from Christ, and that in the logical order the powers are not from above downward, but it *does* show that the ministry stands in the Church, not over and above it, and that it is of and from the Church, as well as from Christ. Sunder the two, and you get at last a Romish priesthood, which is a sort of independent Church in itself. The relation between ministry and laity is living, organic. The ministry does not grow out of the universal priesthood of believers in the sense that the laity appoint them to represent and exercise for them the priestly function, but the universal priesthood is the condition for a special priesthood.

It is important that this close relation between the two should be apprehended. There is a medium here between the one extreme of denying all special character and divine authority for the ministry, and the other extreme of sundering it from the body of which it is an organic part. Perhaps the author would not differ in his view on this point; but he uses the word Church as though it referred only to the laity, and the ministry something apart from it. Whenever the ministry forgets this and becomes separated from the people in its idea and life, it loses its vitality, and becomes a dead function. The author brings this out beautifully in another part of the sermon where he shows that the ministry must be *human* in order to be in warm living sympathy with those to whom they minister. But this is not enough. They must not only be human as standing above the Church, but also as standing in and of it. There is an important relationship between the general and special priesthood in the Christian Church.

While agreeing with the sermon in its main features, we, of course, do not allow any necessary connection between these and the peculiar theory of the Episcopal Church in regard to the three orders, *jure divino*, in the Christian ministry. We thank the author, an old and beloved friend and brother, for sending us the sermon, and wish him abundant success in his work in the holy ministry.

THE HOLY BIBLE, According to the Authorized Version (A. D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation by Bishops and Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M. A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Vol. V. Isaiah—Jeremiah—Lamentations. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Company. 1875.

THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION, 1517 to 1648. By Ludwig Häusser. Edited by Wilhelm Oncken, Professor of History at the University of Giessen. Translated by Mrs. G. Sturge. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1874.

DEUTSCHE GESCHICHTE ZEITALTER DER REFORMATION VON LEOPOLD VON RAUKE. 3 Vols. Leipzig, Verlag von Dunker und Humblot. 1873.

The first of the above-named works is a continuation of the Speaker's Commentary, by Bishops and other clergy of the Anglican Church. Four volumes have preceded it, namely: Vol. I., on the Pentateuch; Vols. II. and III., on the historical books from Joshua to Esther; Vol. IV., on Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon. The work thus far has met with a favorable reception. It presents the results of the latest and best Biblical study and criticism, without being encumbered by multitudinous notes. The Common Version is placed at the top of the page, and the numerous corrections of its renderings are scattered among the expository notes below. In this last volume, the first part, on Isaiah's prophecies, is by W. Kay, D. D., Rector of Great Leghs. The second part, on the prophecies of Jeremiah and Lamentations, is by R. Paine Smith, D. D., Dean of Canterbury.

The second work we have had for some time, but, so far as we can remember, no notice of it has appeared in this Review. It contains a course of lectures, 49 in number, delivered by Häusser at Heidelberg, in 1859–60, which were taken down in short-hand by the editor, Wilhelm Oncken. The lectures preserve the animated and popular style in which they were delivered, and are valuable mainly for giving a full and graphic history of the secular side of the Reformation, the movements that took place in the political world during that period. In this respect it complements the history by Prof. Fisher, of Yale College, published several years ago. It brings the history of the Reformation down to the close of the Thirty Years' War, of which it presents a graphic outline. Like the work of Dr. Fisher, it omits any reference to the origin of the German Reformed Church in the Palatinate. This seems very strange, though it may be more accountable in Häusser, who is so largely concerned with political events, than in Fisher. Certainly the origin of the Reformed Church in the Palatinate, with the formation of the Heidelberg Catechism, is quite as important an event, ecclesiastically, as the Synod of Dort and the Articles there produced. Those who wish to extend their reading still further, especially on the political aspects of the Reformation, will find the material in the work of Rauke—in three vols.—each containing over seven hundred pages.

63

3 1198 04015 1461
N/1198/04015/1461X

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA

3 1198 04015 1461

N/1198/04015/1461X